arXiv:1101.5961v3 [math.OA] 5 Nov 2012

Pure inductive limit state and Kolmogorov's property-II

Anilesh Mohari

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences,

Taramani, CIT Campus, Chennai-600113

E-mail:anilesh@imsc.res.in, Date:20 July 2012

Abstract

We prove that a weaker Kolmogorov's type of asymptotic criteria is not only sufficient but also necessary for purity. As an application of our main results, we prove a translation invariant pure state on a two sided quantum spin chain in lattice dimension one gives rises only type-I or type-III factor when it is restricted to one side of the quantum spin chain. Further in case the restricted state is type-I then it admits Kolmogorov's property. We give a complete classification for the class of translation invariant dynamics on quantum spin chain which admits Kolmogorov's property. The main result says that two translation dynamical systems with states admitting Kolmogorov's property are isomorphic. It surprises once more that our intuition in classical probability has it's limitation to understand quantum situation as class of isomorphism in the quantum spin chain need not be local as in Ornstein's isomorphism [Or]. We also extend results on one-dimensional lattice to higher dimensional lattices.

1 Introduction:

Let $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}^k} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ be the uniformly hyper-finite C^*-algebra over the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^k$ of dimension $k \geq 1$, where $M_d(\mathbb{C})$ be the $d \times d$-matrices over complex field $\mathbb{C}$. A state ω on $\mathcal{B}$ is called translation invariant if $\omega(x) = \omega(\theta_{\bar{m}}(x))$ where $\bar{m} = (m_1, m_2, ., m_k)$ and $\theta_{\bar{m}}$ is the translation induced by $\bar{\mathbb{Z}} \to \bar{\mathbb{Z}} + \bar{m}$ for all

$\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^k$. It is well known since late 60's [Po1] that a translation invariant state is a factor state if and only if

$$\omega(x\theta_{\bar{m}}(y)) \to \omega(x)\omega(y)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ as $|m| \to \infty$. Such a criteria is used extensively to show that KMS states of a translation invariant Hamiltonian on the lattice forms a simplex and it's extreme points are translation invariant factor states. For more details and an account until 1980 we refer to [BR-vol2] and also [Sim] for later edition. In particular this criteria also used to prove existence of phase transition in positive temperature for various class of translation invariant Hamiltonian by Powers [Po2], Ruelle [Ru] and many other authors (see citation within [BR-vol-2]). Such an elegant criteria were missing for a translation invariant pure state.

A semi-group of endomorphism $(\alpha_t : t \in \mathbb{T}_+)$ on a von-Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is called by R. T. Powers [Po4] a shift if $\bigcap_{t \ge 0} \alpha_t(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{C}$. William Arveson raised question in the introduction of his paper [Ar1] on the merit of R. T. Power's notion of shift [Po4] as no clear connection were visible whether such a shift is unitary equivalent to direct sum of semi-group of endomorphism implemented by usual one-sided shift on $L^2(\mathbb{T}_+)$. At this stage we recall a semi-group of isometry $U_t : t \ge 0$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is called shift if $\bigcap_{t \ge 0} U_t\mathcal{H} = \{0\}$ and such a shift is unitary equivalent to direct sum of unilateral shift on $L^2(\mathbb{T}_+)$ given by $U_tf(x) = f(x-t)$ for $x \ge t$ otherwise 0. William Arveson called the above mathematical property as pure and explored how such a notion is related to an invariant normal state ψ_0 to be absorbing i.e. $||\psi\alpha_t - \psi_0|| \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ for any normal state ψ on $\mathcal{A}$. However it is known there after [BJP] that there are examples of shift in the sense of [Po4] which does not admit an invariant normal state on $\mathcal{A}$ and thus notion of purity in the sense of [Ar1] is relevant when such an endomorphism admits an invariant normal state. In such a case William Arveson proved that Power's shift property is equivalent to the invariant state to be absorbing. However the question William Arveson puts on the merit of calling it a shift by Power's remained unanswered even when it admits an invariant normal state and neither it is clear why such a shift is called pure as only for a special situation it was shown that such an endomorphism on the algebra of bounded operators on a Hilbert space with finite dimensional support projection is co-cycle conjugate to CCR flows [Ar2]. On the other hand the GNS space associated with the unique trace on $\mathcal{B}_0 = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_+} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ with the unilateral shift gives a simple example of a shift in the sense of Powers whose inductive limit state is also the unique trace on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ and thus not pure. It is clear that Power's criteria is not enough to ensure inductive limit state to be pure. A systematic attempt has been made in [BJKW] for a sufficient condition for purity focusing on a spacial situation where the lattice dimension is one. However the main statement given in the last section of the paper namely Theorem 7.1 in [BJKW] is faulty (see also [KMSW] for comments on this work and [Mo4] for a remedy with correct statements and proof which uses results of section 2 of the present paper). Thus Powers's notion of shift is not the right analogue of shift in the traditional sense of classical probability theory where shift is also accompanied by a filtration i.e. a tower of two sided $\sigma-$-fields as formulated in Kolmogorov-Sinai theory [Pa] on dynamical systems or Kolmogorov's shift as a generalization of Bernoulli shift. In this present exposition we adopt the classical point of view as in the originally proposed [AM] for a notion of Kolmogorov's shift valid in the present context which was investigated in details in [Mo1,Mo2]. Here we aim to continue that line of investigation to complete the program in a more general C^*-algebraic set up. In the following we briefly outline our main results of this paper.

Let $\mathbb{T}$ be either $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$ and $T_+ = \{t \geq 0 : t \in T\}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_0$ be a C^* algebra,

$(\lambda_t : \ t \geq 0)$ be a semi-group of injective endomorphisms and ψ be an invariant state for $(\lambda_t : t \geq 0)$. We extend (λ_t) to an automorphism on the C^* algebra $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ of the inductive limit

$$\mathcal{B}_0 \rightarrow^{\lambda_t} \mathcal{B}_0 \rightarrow^{\lambda_t} \mathcal{B}_0$$

and extend also the state ψ to $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ by requiring (λ_t) invariance. Thus there exists a directed set (i.e. indexed by $I\!\!T$, by inclusion $\mathcal{B}_{[-s} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{[-t}$ if and only if $t \geq s$) of C*-subalgebras $\mathcal{B}_{[t}$ of $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ so that the uniform closure of $\bigcup_{s \in I\!\!T} \mathcal{B}_{[s}$ is $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$. Moreover there exists an isomorphism

$$i_0 : \mathcal{B}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{[0}$$

(we refer [Sa] for general facts on inductive limit of C*-algebras). It is simple to note that $i_t = \lambda_t \circ i_0$ is an isomorphism of $\mathcal{B}_0$ onto $\mathcal{B}_{[t}$ and

$$\psi_{[-\infty} i_t = \psi$$

on $\mathcal{B}_0$.

Let $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ be the GNS space associated with $(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}, \psi_{[-\infty})$ and (λ_t) be the unique normal extension to $\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})''$. Thus the vector state $\psi_\Omega(X) = < \Omega, X\Omega >$ is an invariant state for automorphism (λ_t). As $\lambda_t(\mathcal{B}_{[0}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{[0}$ for all $t \geq 0$, $(\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})'', \lambda_t, \ t \geq 0, \psi_\Omega)$ is a quantum dynamics of endomorphisms. Let $F_{t]}$ be the support projection of the normal vector state Ω in the von-Neumann sub-algebra $\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[t})''$. $F_{t]} \in \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[t})'' \subseteq \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})''$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence of projections as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. Let the projection $F_{-\infty]}$ be the limit. Thus $F_{-\infty]} \geq [\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})'\Omega] \geq |\Omega >< \Omega|$. So $F_{-\infty]} = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ is a sufficient condition for $\psi_{[-\infty}$ on $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ to be pure. We say the dynamics $(\mathcal{B}_0, \lambda_t : t \geq 0, \psi_0)$ satisfies *Kolmogorov's property* if $F_{-\infty]} = |\Omega >< \Omega|$.

We also consider the GNS space $(\mathcal{H}_{\psi_0}, \pi_{\psi_0}, \Omega_0)$ associated with $(\mathcal{B}_0, \psi_0)$ and set $P = [\pi_{\psi_0}(\mathcal{B})'\Omega_0]$ for the support projection of the state ψ_0 on the von-Neumann algebra $\pi(\mathcal{B}_0)''$. Let $(\lambda_t : t \geq 0)$ be the induced semi-group of endomorphism on $\pi_{\psi_0}(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ associated with $(\lambda_t : \ t \geq 0)$. P being the support projection of ψ_0 in $\pi_{\psi_0}(\mathcal{B}_0)''$, we have $\psi_0(P\lambda_t(1-P)P) = \psi_0(\lambda_t(1-P)) = \psi_0(1-P) = 0$, and so $\lambda_t(P) \geq P$ for all $t \geq 0$. Thus the map $\tau_t : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$ defined by $\tau_t(x) = P\lambda_t(PxP)P$ [Mo2] is a semi-group of unital completely positive normal maps on $\mathcal{A}_0$ where $\mathcal{A}_0 = P\pi_{\psi_0}(\mathcal{B}_0)''P$ is the corner von-Neumann algebra acting on the subspace $\mathcal{K} = P\mathcal{H}$. The state $\phi_0(x) =< \Omega_0, PxP\Omega_0 >$ is faithful and normal on $\mathcal{A}_0$ and invariant for $(\tau_t : t \geq 0)$.

In [Mo1] we have shown that the state $(\mathcal{B}_0, \lambda_t : t \geq 0, \psi_0)$ admits Kolmogorov property if and only if $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Using separating property of Ω for $\mathcal{A}_0$, we easily check that the criteria is equivalent to $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ in strong operator topology. However this condition is not necessary (see section 3) for purity as there are cases where (τ_t) is a semi-group of endomorphisms with pure inductive limit state $\psi_{[-\infty}$. Thus purity is a weaker notion then the Kolmogorov's shift property.

Here we refine first our work [AM,Mo1,Mo2] on dilation problem associated with $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t : t \geq 0, \phi_0)$ as a motivation to prove in section 3 that $\psi_{[-\infty}$ is pure if and only if for each $t \geq 0$, there exists element $x_t \in \mathcal{A}_0$ so that for each $s \geq 0$, $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)x^*_{s+t}x_{s+t}\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Exploring the time reverse backward process, we also find it's relation with asymptotic behavior of KMS adjoint Markov semi-group $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{\tau}_t, \phi_0)$ [AcC,OP,Mo1]. A direct proof of an equivalent criteria on dual Markov semi-group without using the dual process is not visible. Further purity also says that $\mathcal{G} = \{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \tau_t(x)\tau_t(x^*) = \tau_t(xx^*), \ \sigma_s\tau_t(x) = \tau_t\sigma_s(x) \ t \geq 0, \ s \in I\!\!R\}$ is equal to trivial von-Neumann sub-algebra $\{zI : z \in I\!\!C\}$, where $(\sigma_s : s \in I\!\!R)$ is the Tomita's modular group on $\mathcal{A}_0$ associated with faithful normal state ϕ_0.

As a continuation of our work done on type of factor arises in the dilation problem [Mo3] we also prove that a pure inductive limit state $(\phi_{[-\infty}, \mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})$ once restricted to $\mathcal{B}_{[0}$ is either a type-I or a type-III factor state. We also prove here that Kolmogorov's property and strong mixing property are equivalent when $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a type-I von-Neumann algebra with completely atomic center.

For $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$, we also set notation $\mathcal{B}_R = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_+} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathcal{B}_L = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_-} M_d(\mathbb{C})$. For a factor state on ω on $\mathcal{B}$, we say it admits *Haag duality* property if $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)'' = \pi(\mathcal{B}_L)'$. It is clear that a factor state which admits such a property is pure. The question on converse is quite involved unless $\pi(\mathcal{A}_0)''$ is type-I factor. We prove in [Mo4] that any translation invariant pure state admits Haag duality property which we will not use it here. In [AM] we also had a detailed discussion on how the notion of Kolmogorov's shift is related with system of imprimitivity associated with group $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$. In case pure state does give rises to a system of imprimitivity (which is not necessary) with filtration generated by support projection of ω in $\mathcal{B}_R$ by translation, Stone-von-Neumann theorem plays an important role in proving Haag duality. For a more general situation proof is more involved with a variation of the above argument and an interested reader is referred to [Mo4] for further results for application of this property in studying symmetries and correlation of such a pure translation invariant state with addition symmetry. Results in section 3 is a building block for results obtained in [Mo4].

Translation invariant pure states ψ on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ often appear as ground states of a translation invariant Hamiltonian [BR, vol-2], where $M_d(\mathbb{C})$ is $d-$ dimensional matrices over complex numbers. In that context we come across both type-I [FVN1,FVN2] and type-III$_1$ factors states ψ on

$\mathcal{B}_0 = \otimes_N M_d(\mathbb{C})$ [AMa,Ma]. As an application of our criteria, we find an easy proof that a translation invariant pure state on $\mathcal{B}$ will give rise either to a type-I or type-III factor state once restricted to $\mathcal{B}_0$. In [Mo4] we explore some additional symmetry of a translation invariant pure state to find criteria for the factor state ψ_0 on $\mathcal{B}_0$ to be type-I. It seems that in the literature no examples are known with such a pure ψ on $\mathcal{B}$ where $\psi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ is type-III$_0$. It is not hard to rule out the possibility that $\psi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ can not be a type-III$_\lambda$ factor for any $\lambda \in (0,1)$. One finer question that is of importance in studying symmetry and correlations of a translation invariant state: how type-I or type-III properties of ψ_0 on $\mathcal{B}_0$ gets determined by some additional symmetry of the state ψ_0 or degrees of freedom that an electron enjoys in an ordered magnetic materials [AL]. These facts now find it's importance for further investigation on the dichotomy of the ground states, conjectures by Haldane [AL,AKLT,Ma2] on H_{XXX} isotropic anti ferromagnetic models. For partial response on this conjecture we refer to [Mo4] for results on split property and spontaneous symmetry breaking. Same problem on higher dimensional lattice would be of great importance in condense matter physics where very little mathematically general rigorous results are known [BR-vol-2,Sim], which is now an active area for numerical simulation. Though results in section 3 is primarily motivated for application in statistical mechanics, we assume no knowledge in statistical mechanics in the present text. We have an appendix where we gave a sketch of a proof that purity does not give Kolmogorov's property. The appendix is based on a private communication that I had some time back with Taku Matsui. I express my thanks and gratitude for his comments.

2 Kolmogorov's property of stationary Markov processes and purity:

Let $I\!\!T$ be either $I\!\!R$, set of real numbers or $Z\!\!\!Z$, set of integers and $I\!\!T_+$ is non-negative numbers of $I\!\!T$. Let $\tau_t : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0,\ I\!\!T_+$ be a semi-group of completely positive unital normal maps on a von-Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ with a normal invariant state ϕ_0. In case we are dealing with $I\!\!T = I\!\!R$, we also assume that for each $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$, the map $t \rightarrow \tau_t(x)$ is continuous in the weak* topology. Here we review the construction of stationary Markov process given as in [AM] in order to fix the notations and important properties.

We consider the class $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{A}_0$ valued functions $\underline{x} : I\!\!T \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$ so that $x_r \neq I$ for finitely many supported points and equip with the point-wise multiplication $(\underline{xy})_r = x_r y_r$. We define the map $L : (\underline{\mathcal{M}} \times \underline{\mathcal{M}}) \rightarrow I\!\!C$ by

$$L(\underline{x},\underline{y}) = \phi_0(x^*_{r_n}\tau_{r_n - r_{n-1}}(x^*_{r_{n-1}}(.....x^*_{r_2}\tau_{r_2 - r_1}(x^*_{r_1}y_{r_1})y_{r_2})...y_{r_{n-1}})y_{r_n}) \qquad (2.1)$$

where $\underline{r} = (r_1, r_2, ..r_n)\ r_1 \leq r_2 \leq .. \leq r_n$ is a finite collection of points in $Z\!\!\!Z$ containing both the support sets of $\underline{x}$ or $\underline{y}$. That this kernel is well defined follows from our hypothesis that $\tau_t(I) = I,\ t \geq 0$ and the invariance of the state ϕ_0 for τ. The complete positiveness of τ implies that the map L is a non-negative definite form on the set $\underline{\mathcal{M}}$. Thus there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and a map $\lambda : \underline{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$< \lambda(\underline{x}), \lambda(\underline{y}) >= L(\underline{x},\underline{y}).$$

Often we will omit the symbol λ to simplify our notations unless more then one such maps are involved. For detailed and historical account we refer to articles [AFL,EL,Vi,Sa,BhP].

We use the symbol Ω for the unique element in $\mathcal{H}$ associated with $x = (x_r = I,\ r \in I\!\!T)$ and the associated vector state ϕ on $B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by $\phi(X) =< \Omega, X\Omega >$.

For each $t \in I\!\!T$ we define shift operator $S_t : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ by the following prescription:

$$(S_t \underline{x})_r = x_{r+t} \tag{2.2}$$

It is simple to note that $S = ((S_t,\ t \in I\!\!T))$ is a unitary group of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ with Ω as an invariant element and the map $t \to S_t$ is continuous in strong operator topology as the map $(t, x) \to \tau_t(x)$ is sequentially continuous in weak* topology. For details we refer to [AM].

For any $t \in I\!\!T$ we set

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{t]} = \{\underline{x} \in \underline{\mathcal{M}},\ x_r = I\ \forall r > t\}$$

and $F_{t]}$ for the projection onto $\mathcal{H}_{t]}$, the closed linear span of $\{\lambda(\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{t]})\}$. For any $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $t \in I\!\!R$ we also set elements $i_t(x), \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}$ defined by

$$i_t(x)_r = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } r = t \\ I, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We also note that $i_t(x) \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}_{t]}$ and set $\star$-homomorphisms $j^0_0 : \mathcal{A}_0 \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{0]})$ defined by

$$j^0_0(x)\underline{y} = i_0(x)\underline{y}$$

for all $\underline{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}_{0]}$. That $j^0_0(x)$ is a well defined isometry follows from (2.1) once we verify that it preserves the non-negative kernel whenever x is an isometry. For any arbitrary element x which is a linear sum of at most four isometry, we extend by linearity [AM]. Now we define $j^f_0 : \mathcal{A}_0 \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ by

$$j^f_0(x) = j^0_0(x)F_{0]}.$$

Thus j^f_0 is a $*$-homomorphism of $\mathcal{A}_0$ at time $t = 0$ with $j^f_0(I) = F_{0]}$. Now we use the shift (S_t) to obtain the process $j^f = (j^f_t : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}),\ t \in I\!\!T)$ and forward filtration $F = (F_{t]},\ t \in I\!\!T)$ defined by the following prescription:

$$j^f_t(x) = S_t j^f_0(x) S^*_t \quad F_{t]} = S_t F_{0]} S^*_t,\ \ t \in I\!\!T. \tag{2.3}$$

So it follows by our construction that $j^f_{r_1}(y_1) j^f_{r_2}(y_2)...j^f_{r_n}(y_n)\Omega = \underline{y}$ where $y_r = y_{r_i},$ if $r = r_i$ otherwise $I,$ $(r_1 \le r_2 \le .. \le r_n)$. Thus Ω is a cyclic vector for the von-Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}_{[-\infty}$ generated by $\{j^f_r(x),\ r \in I\!\!T, x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$. From (2.4) we also conclude that $S_t X S^*_t \in \mathcal{A}_{[-\infty}$ whenever $X \in \mathcal{A}_{[-\infty}$ and thus we can set a family of automorphism (α_t) on $\mathcal{A}$ defined by

$$\alpha_t(X) = S_t X S^*_t.$$

Since Ω is an invariant element for (S_t), ϕ is an invariant normal state for (α_t).

We also claim that

$$F_{s]} j^f_t(x) F_{s]} = j^f_s(\tau_{t-s}(x))\ \ \forall s \le t. \tag{2.4}$$

For that purpose we choose any two elements $\underline{y}, \underline{y'} \in \lambda(\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{s]})$ and check the following steps with the aid of (2.1) and (2.2):

$$< \underline{y}, F_{s]} j^f_t(x) F_{s]} \underline{y'} > = < \underline{y}, i_t(x) \underline{y'} >$$

$$= < \underline{y}, i_s(\tau_{t-s}(x)) \underline{y'}) > .$$

Since $\lambda(\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{s]})$ spans $\mathcal{H}_{s]}$ it completes the proof of our claim.

We set as in [Mo1] a tower of increasing von-Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}_{[t}$ with decreasing parameter $t \in I\!\!T$ by setting $\mathcal{A}_{[t}$ to be the von-Neumann algebra generated by $\{j^f_s(x) : t \le s < \infty,\ x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$ and so $\mathcal{A}_{[-\infty} = \vee_{t \in I\!\!T} \mathcal{A}_{[t}$. Forward Markov property also ensures that $F_{t]} \mathcal{A}_{[t} F_{t]} = j_t(\mathcal{A}_0)$ [Mo1].

For any element $\underline{x} \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}$, we verify by the relation $< \underline{y}, F_{t]}\underline{x} =< \underline{y}, \underline{x} >$ for all $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{M}_{t]}$ that

$$(F_{t]}\underline{x})_r = \begin{cases} x_r, & \text{if } r < t; \\ \tau_{r_k - t}(...\tau_{r_{n-1}-r_{n-2}}(\tau_{r_n - r_{n-1}}(x_{r_n})x_{r_{n-1}})...x_t), & \text{if } r = t \\ I, & \text{if } r > t \end{cases}$$

where $r_1 \le .. \le r_k \le t \le .. \le r_n$ is the support of $\underline{x}$. The result follows once we note that for any fix $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{H}$ if $t \le r_1, r_1'$, where r_1, r_1' are the lowest support of $\underline{x}$ and $\underline{y}$ respectively,

$$< \underline{x}, F_{t]}\underline{y} >=< F_{t]}\underline{x}, F_{t]}\underline{y} >$$

$$= \phi_0[(\tau_{r_1 - t}(...\tau_{r_{n-1}-r_{n-2}}(\tau_{r_n - r_{n-1}}(x_{r_n})x_{r_{n-1}})...x_{r_1}))^*$$

$$\tau_{r_1' - t}(...\tau_{r_{m-1}' - r_{m-2}'}(\tau_{r_m' - r_{m-1}'}(y_{r_m'})y_{r_{m-1}'})...y_{r_1'})]$$

Thus $F_{t]} \rightarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$ if and only if $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$. In such a case we have $\mathcal{A}_{[-\infty} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Further since $S_t\Omega = \Omega$ and $F_{t]}\Omega = \Omega$, we get an imprimitivity systems $(\mathcal{H} \ominus |\Omega >< \Omega|, S_t, F_{t]} \ominus |\Omega >< \Omega| : t \in I\!\!T)$ for the group $I\!\!T$, by restricting actions of $S_t, F_{t]}$ on the orthogonal complement $I_{\mathcal{H}} \ominus |\Omega >< \Omega|$ of $|\Omega >< \Omega|$. Such a property is called [Mo1] Kolmogorov's property for (τ_t) and associated imprimitivity system $(I_{\mathcal{H}} \ominus |\Omega >< \Omega|, S_t, F_{t]} \ominus |\Omega >< \Omega|)$ is called Kolmogorov shift. We will deal with this notion in the context of quantum spin chain in section 4 and 5. However Kolmogorov's property is not necessary for $\mathcal{A}_{[-\infty}$ to be $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ even when ϕ_0 is faithful. For details see the appendix. We will not use this in results proved here.

We also recall that triplet $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ is called ergodic, strong mixing if (S_t) is ergodic strong mixing respectively. For details we refer to [AM] where simple correspondence were established. For further details we also refer to [Mo1].

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for purity i.e. $\mathcal{A}_{[-\infty} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

THEOREM 2.1: The following statements are equivalent:

(a) For each $t \geq 0$, there exists an element $x_t \in \mathcal{A}_0$ so that $x_t \rightarrow I$ in strong operator topology and for each $s \geq 0$, $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)x^*_{s+t}x_{s+t}\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$;

(b) $\vee_{t \in I\!R}\mathcal{A}_{[t} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$

PROOF: First we will prove (a) implies (b). Fix such a sequence x_t with property (a). We consider the sequence of elements $j_{-t}(x_t) : t \geq 0\}$. We claim that $j_{-t}(x_t) \rightarrow |\Omega><\Omega|$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in strong operator topology. To that end we fix an element $\underline{y}$ with support $(s_0 \leq s_1 \leq .. \leq s_n)$ and $y(s_k) = y_k$ to check that for all $-t \leq s_0$ we have

$$||j_{-t}(x_t)\underline{y}||^2 = \phi_0(\tau_{t+s_0}(y^*)x^*_t x_t \tau_{t+s_0}(y))$$

where $y = \tau_{s_n - s_{n-1}}(y_n \tau_{s_{n-1}-s_{n-2}}(y_{n-2}\tau_{s_1 - s_0}(y_1)y_0))$ as

$$F_{s_0} j_{s_n}(y_n) j_{s_{n-1}}(y_{n-1})..j_{s_0}(y_0)F_{s_0}$$

$$= j_{s_0}(\tau_{s_n - s_{n-1}}(y_n \tau_{s_{n-1}-s_{n-2}}(y_{n-2}\tau_{s_1-s_0}(y_1)y_0)))$$

Thus

$$||j_{-t}(x_t)\underline{y}||^2 =$$

$$\phi_0(\tau_{t+s_0}(y^*)x^*_t x_t \tau_{t+s_0}(y))$$

Thus

$$\rightarrow |\phi_0(y)|^2 = |<\Omega, \underline{y}>|^2$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ by (a) for all $s_0 \leq 0$.

Similarly we also have

$$<\underline{y'}, j_{-t}(x_t)\underline{y}>=<j_{-t}(I)\underline{y'}, j_{-t}(x_t)\underline{y}>=\phi_0(\tau_{t+s_0}(y'^*)x_t\tau_{t+s_0}(y)) \rightarrow <\underline{y'}, \Omega><\Omega, \underline{y}>$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ follows along the same line since for each $s \geq 0$,

$$\phi_0(\tau_t(x)x_{s+t}\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (as first we use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to prove the statement for all x for which $\phi_0(x) = 0$ and then replace x by $x - \phi_0(x)I$). We combine now above two statements to prove $j_{-t}(x_t) \rightarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in strong operator topology as $t \rightarrow \infty$ as the family $\{j_{-t}(x_t) : t \geq 0\}$ is uniformly norm bounded as $x_t \rightarrow 1$ in strong operator topology by (a) and each j_{-t} is an injective isomorphism (in particular contractive property).

For the converse we use Kaplansky's density theorem to ensure existence of contractive elements $Y_t \in \mathcal{A}_{[t}$ so that $Y_t \rightarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in strong operator topology as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. Since $F_{t]}\mathcal{A}_{[t}F_{t]} = j_t(\mathcal{A}_0)$ we also have $F_{t]}Y_{[t}F_{t]} = j_t(y_t)$ for some $y_t \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Since $F_{t]} \rightarrow F_{-\infty]} \geq |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in strong operator topology as $t \rightarrow -\infty$, we conclude also that $j_t(y_t) \rightarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in strong operator topology. Now we compute for $t \geq s \geq 0$ that

$$< j_{-t}(y_{-t})j_{-s}(y)\Omega, j_{-t}(y_{-t})j_{-s}(x)\Omega >= \phi_0(\tau_{t-s}(y^*)y^*_{-t}y_{-t}\tau_{t-s}(x))$$

and thus we conclude (a) with $x_t = y_{-t}$ for all $t \geq 0$. ■

That Kolmogorov's property implies strong mixing property [AM,Mo1] i.e. $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$ in weak operator topology follows by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $|\phi_0(\tau_t(x^*)y)| \leq \phi_0(\tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x))\phi_0(y^*y)$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Within the frame work of classical probability theory it is well known that Kolmogorov's property is preserved when we reverse the direction of time evolution of an automorphism on a measure space preserving a probability measure. A simple proof follows from Kolmogorov-Sinai-Rohklin theorem which gives criteria of positive dynamical entropy [Pa] for an automorphism to be a Kolmogorov's automorphism. Such a notion in terms of a quantum dynamical entropy is still missing within the frame work of Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy [NeS]. Further now one can as well ask the same question about weak Kolmogorov's or purity property i.e. whether such a property is time reversible.

In the following text we aim to investigate how time reverse process is related to the notion of weak Kolmogorov's property and also with Kolmogorov's property. Following [AM], we will consider the time reverse process associated with the KMS-adjoint quantum dynamical semi-group $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{\tau}, \phi_0)$. First we recall from [AM] time reverse process associated with the KMS-adjoint semi-group in the following paragraph.

Let ϕ_0 be also a faithful state and without loss of generality let also $(\mathcal{A}_0, \phi_0)$ be in the standard form $(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{J}, \Delta, \mathcal{P}, \omega_0)$ [BR] where $\omega_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0$, a cyclic and separating vector for $\mathcal{A}_0$, so that $\phi_0(x) =< \omega_0, x\omega_0 >$ and the closure of the close-able operator $S_0 : x\omega_0 \rightarrow x^*\omega_0, S$ possesses a polar decomposition $S = \mathcal{J}\Delta^{1/2}$ with the self-dual positive cone $\mathcal{P}$ as the closure of $\{\mathcal{J}x\mathcal{J}x\omega_0 : x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$ in $\mathcal{H}_0$. Tomita's [BR] theorem says that $\Delta^{it}\mathcal{A}_0\Delta^{-it} = \mathcal{A}_0,\ t \in I\!R$ and $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{A}_0\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{A}_0'$, where $\mathcal{A}_0'$ is the commutant of $\mathcal{A}_0$. We define the modular automorphism group $\sigma = (\sigma_t,\ t \in I\!\Gamma)$ on $\mathcal{A}_0$ by

$$\sigma_t(x) = \Delta^{it}x\Delta^{-it}$$

which satisfies the modular relation

$$\phi_0(x\sigma_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)) = \phi_0(\sigma_{\frac{i}{2}}(y)x)$$

for any two analytic elements x, y for the automorphism. A more useful form for modular relation here

$$\phi_0(\sigma_{-\frac{i}{2}}(x^*)^*\sigma_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y^*)) = \phi_0(y^*x)$$

which shows that $\mathcal{J}x\Omega = \sigma_{-\frac{i}{2}}(x^*)\Omega$. Furthermore for any normal state ψ on $\mathcal{A}_0$ there exists an unique vector $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$ so that $\psi(x) =< \zeta, x\zeta >$.

We consider the unique Markov semi-group (τ'_t) on the commutant $\mathcal{A}'_0$ of $\mathcal{A}_0$ so that $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)y) = \phi_0(x\tau'_t(y))$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}'_0$. Proof follows a standard application of Dixmier lemma a variation of Radon-Nikodym theorem [OP]. We define weak* continuous Markov semi-group $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$ on $\mathcal{A}_0$ by $\tilde{\tau}_t(x) = \mathcal{J}\tau'_t(\mathcal{J}x\mathcal{J})\mathcal{J}$. Thus we have the following adjoint relation

$$\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\sigma_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)) = \phi_0(\sigma_{\frac{i}{2}}(x)\tilde{\tau}_t(y)) \tag{2.5}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$, analytic elements for (σ_t).

We consider the forward weak Markov processes $(\mathcal{H}, S_t, j^f_t, F_{t]}, F_{[t}, \quad t \in I\!\!T, \; \Omega)$ associated with $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \; t \geq 0, \; \phi_0)$ and the forward weak Markov processes $(\tilde{H}, \tilde{S}_t, \; \tilde{j}^f_t, \tilde{F}_{t]}, \tilde{F}_{[t},, \; t \in I\!\!T, \; \tilde{\Omega})$ associated with $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{\tau}_t, \; t \geq 0, \; \phi_0)$.

Now following a basic idea of G.H. Hunt, as in [AM], here we consider the transformation $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ generalizing Tomita's conjugate operator given by $\tilde{x}(t) = \sigma_{-\frac{i}{2}}(x(-t)^*)$ for $x \in \mathcal{H}$ supported on analytic elements of the modular automorphism group of ϕ_0. We recall that modular condition and duality property will ensure that such a transformation is anti-inner product preserving and thus extends to an anti-unitary operator $U_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ which takes x to $\tilde{x}$. Further there exists a unique backward weak Markov processes $(j^b_t), (\tilde{j}^b_t)$ which generalizes Tomita's representation $\pi^b_0 : x \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_0\pi_0(x^*)\mathcal{J}_0 \in \mathcal{A}'_0$ (linear anti-isomorphism) so that

$$F_{[s}j^b_t(x)F_{[s} = j^b_s(\tilde{\tau}_{s-t}(x))$$

for $-\infty < t \leq s < \infty$.

$$\tilde{F}_{[s}\tilde{j}^b_t(x)\tilde{F}_{[s} = \tilde{j}^b_s(\tau_{s-t}(x))$$

for $-\infty < t \leq s < \infty$. We set tower of increasing von-Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}^b_{t]}$ in backward direction with increasing parameter $t \in I\!\!T$ by setting $\mathcal{A}^b_{t]} =$

$\{j^b_s(x) \, : \, -\infty < s \leq t, \; x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}''$ and $\mathcal{A}^b_{\infty]} = \vee_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mathcal{A}^b_{t]}$. Once more we have $F_{[t} \mathcal{A}^b_{t]} F_{[t} = j^b_t(\mathcal{A}_0)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{T}$ by backward Markov property [Mo1].

We have more details in the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.2: [AM] There exists an unique anti-unitary operator $U_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ so that

(a) $U_0 \Omega = \tilde{\Omega}$;

(b) $U_0 S_t U_0^* = \tilde{S}_{-t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$;

(c) $U_0 F_{t]} U_0^* = \tilde{F}_{[-t}, \;\; U_0 F_{[t} U_0^* = \tilde{F}_{-t]}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$;

(d) We set backward processes $j^b_t : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\tilde{j}^b_t : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ as injective $*$-anti-homomorphism so that

$$j^b_t(x) = U_0^* \tilde{j}^f_{-t}(x^*) U_0$$

$$\tilde{j}^b_t(x) = U_0 j^f_{-t}(x^*) U_0^*$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$; Then we have backward Markov property for $s \leq t$:

$$F_{[t} j^b_s(x) F_{[t} = j^b_t(\tilde{\tau}_{t-s}(x)), \;\; , \tilde{F}_{[t} \tilde{j}^b_s(x) \tilde{F}_{[t} = \tilde{j}^b_t(\tau_{t-s}(x))$$

Further $F_{[t} \mathcal{A}^b_{t]} F_{[t} = j^b_t(\mathcal{A}_0)$ and $\tilde{F}_{[t} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^b_{t]} \tilde{F}_{[t} = \tilde{j}^b_t(\mathcal{A}_0)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}$.

PROOF: Properties (a) -(c) are evident by our construction of anti-unitary operator U_0. Backward weak Markov property follows once we use U_0 for push forward method from forward weak Markov property of dual forward Weak Markov processes. Last part also follows via U_0 as we have $F_{t]} \mathcal{A}_{[t} F_{t]} = j^f_t(\mathcal{A}_0)$ and $\tilde{\tilde{\tau}}_t = \tau_t; t \geq 0$. ■

Exploring Markov property of both forward and backward processes, Tomita's duality also ensures the following Hunt duality theorem.

THEOREM 2.3: [Mo2] For each $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathcal{A}'_{[t} = \mathcal{A}^b_{t]}$, where $\mathcal{A}_{[t} = \{j^f_s(x) : \; x \in \mathcal{A}_0, s \geq t\}''$ and $\mathcal{A}^b_{t]} = \{j^b_s(x) : x \in \mathcal{A}_0, \; s \leq t\}''$.

PROOF: We refer to Proposition 3.7 in [Mo2]. Note that it only needs weak Markov property for both forward and backward processes and Tomita's duality relation at fiber at $t \in I\!\!T$. ■

THEOREM 2.4: The following statements are equivalent:

(a) For each $t \geq 0$, there exist a contractive element $x_t \in \mathcal{A}_0$ so that for each $s \geq 0$, $x_{s+t}\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$ in strong operator topology i.e. $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)x^*_{s+t}x_{s+t}\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$;

(b) $\vee \mathcal{A}_{[t} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$;

(c) $||\psi\tilde{\tau}_t - \phi_0|| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for any normal state ψ on $\mathcal{A}_0$;

(d) $\bigcap \mathcal{A}^b_{t]} = I\!\!C$

PROOF: That (a) and (b) are equivalent follows from Theorem 2.1 as separating property of Ω for $\mathcal{A}_0$ will ensure that Ω is cyclic for commutant of $\mathcal{A}_0$ and thus $x_{s+t}\tau_t(x)\Omega \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\Omega$ in strong topology is equivalent to $x_{s+t}\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)1$ in strong operator topology. That (b) and (c) are equivalent follows by Proposition 1.1 in [Ar1] and Theorem 2.4 in [Mo2] as support projection of the state in $\mathcal{A}^b_{0]}$ is $[(\mathcal{A}^b_{0]})'\Omega] = [\mathcal{A}_{[0}\Omega] = F_{[0}$ and using time-reversal operator U_0 we also check that for any $Y \in \mathcal{A}^b_{0]}$ there exists a $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ so that $j^b_0(\tilde{\tau}_t(y)) = F_{[0}\alpha_{-t}(Y)F_{[0}$. That (b) and (d) are equivalent follows from duality proved in Theorem 2.3. ■

THEOREM 2.5: Let $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_0, \phi_0)$ be as in Theorem 2.4 and $\vee\mathcal{A}_{[t} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then $\mathcal{G} =^{\text{def}} \{x : \tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x) = x : \ t \geq 0\}$ which is equal to $\{x : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \tau_t(x)\tau(x^*) = \tau_t(xx^*), \ \tau_t\sigma_s(x) = \sigma_s\tau_t(x) : \ t \geq 0, s \in I\!\!R\}$ is trivial.

PROOF: We consider the dynamics $(\mathcal{G}, \tau_t, \phi_0)$. By Proposition 2.2 (a) in [Mo2] there exists a conditional expectation $E : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ onto $\mathcal{G}$ and modular group $(\sigma_t : t \in I\!\!R)$ commutes with $(\tau_t : t \geq 0)$ on $\mathcal{G}$. We claim that

$(\mathcal{G}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ satisfies Kolmogorov's property. As a first step we verify that $\phi_0(\mathcal{J}y\mathcal{J}\tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x)) = \phi_0(\mathcal{J}\tau_t(y)\mathcal{J}\tau_t(x)) \rightarrow \phi_0(y)\phi_0(x)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ as follows:

We fix any $y \geq 0$ so that $\phi_0(y) = 1$ and consider the normal state $\phi(x) = \phi_0(\mathcal{J}y\mathcal{J}x)$ on $\mathcal{A}_0$ and compute the following simple steps

$$|\phi\tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x) - \phi_0(x)| \leq ||\phi\tilde{\tau}_t - \phi_0||||\tau_t(x)||$$

$$\leq ||\phi\tau_t - \phi_0||\ ||x|| \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. For more general y we write it as a linear combination of possibly four such non-negative elements and use linearity of the maps involved to complete the proof of the claim. We write now $\phi_0(\mathcal{J}\tau_t(x)\mathcal{J}\tau_t(x)) = ||\Delta^{1/4}\tau_t(x^*)\Omega||^2$ and note that we have shown that $\Delta^{\frac{1}{4}}\tau_t(x^*)\Omega \rightarrow \phi_0(x^*)\Omega$ strongly as $t \rightarrow \infty$. So far $x \in \mathcal{A}$ but now we will restrict x to $\mathcal{G}$. Since modular group $(\sigma_s : s \in I\!R)$ commute with $(\tau_t : t \geq 0)$ on $\mathcal{G}$, weak* dense subspace of analytic elements [BR1, Proposition 2.5.22] of the form $\{x_n = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}} \int \sigma_s(x)e^{-ns^2}ds : n \geq 1, x \in \mathcal{G}\}$ are also preserved by $(\tau_t : t \geq 0)$.

Thus we legitimately write taking x^* instead x $\Delta^{\frac{1}{4}}\tau_t(x)\Omega = \Delta^{\frac{1}{4}}\tau_t(x)\Delta^{-\frac{1}{4}}\Omega = \tau_t(\sigma_{\frac{i}{4}}(x))\Omega$ for such analytic elements $x \in \mathcal{G}$ for (σ_s). Thus we conclude that $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$ in strong operator topology for a weak* dense sub-space of $\mathcal{G}$ of analytic elements $\mathcal{G}_a$ of modular group (σ_s). Now we remove the restriction on x to be an analytic element as $[\mathcal{G}_a\Omega] = [\mathcal{G}\Omega]$ and $x\Omega \rightarrow \tau_t(x)\Omega$ is a family of contraction on the GNS space associated with ϕ_0.

However since $\tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x)$ for all $t \geq 0$ for $x \in \mathcal{G}$, by invariance of the state we have $\phi_0(x^*x) = |\phi_0(x)|^2$ and thus faithful property of ϕ_0 says that $x = \phi_0(x)I$. This completes the proof that $\mathcal{G}$ is trivial ■

THEOREM 2.6: Let $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ be as in Theorem 2.4 and $\mathcal{A}_0$ be also a type-I von-Neumann algebra with center completely atomic. Then strong mixing property of $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ is equivalent to all the statements (a)-(d) of Theorem 2.4.

PROOF: Strong mixing property is time reversal i.e. $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{\tau}_t, \phi_0)$ is also strongly mixing. By a well known theorem of Dell'Antonio [De] $\mathcal{A}_0$ being type-I with completely atomic center weak limit of a sequence of normal states in the pre-dual space of $\mathcal{A}_0$ is equivalent to strong convergence thus strong mixing property $\psi\tilde{\tau}_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$ for each $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ implies in particular that $||\psi\tilde{\tau}_t - \phi_0|| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for any normal state. ■

PROPOSITION 2.7: Let $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ be a Markov semi-group with a faithful normal invariant state ϕ_0. If $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a factor then $\mathcal{A}_{[0}$ is a factor. In such a case the following also hold:

(a) $\mathcal{A}_0$ is type-I (type-II, type-III) if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{[0}$ is type-I (type -II , type-III) respectively;

(b) $\mathcal{H}$ is separable if and only if $\mathcal{H}_0$ is separable;

(c) If $\mathcal{H}_0$ is separable then $\mathcal{A}_0$ is hyper-finite if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{[0}$ is hyper-finite.

PROOF: We refer [Mo3]. ■

In the Appendix we have an example of a translation invariant pure state ω on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ with a type-III factor once restricted to $\mathcal{B}_0 = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_+} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ i.e. the state ω is faithful on $\mathcal{B}_0$. In such a case $\tau_t : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$ is a semi-group of endomorphisms. This in particular shows that Kolmogorov property is not guaranteed by purity property in general. Further $\mathcal{F} =^{\mbox{def}} \{x : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \tau_t(x)\tau(x^*) = \tau_t(xx^*) : \; t \geq 0\}$ equal to $\mathcal{A}_0$. Theorem 2.5 says however $\mathcal{G}$ is trivial and thus modular group plays a non-trivial role in such a situation. The question that we now focus how situation changes when

$\mathcal{A}_0$ is a type-I factor. In [Theorem 4.7 Mo1] a faulty proof appeared for a claim that strong mixing property of $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ implies Kolmogorov's property. The argument uses Proposition 4.6 in [Mo1] which is faulty. Though Proposition 4.6 in [Mo1] (if part of the statement) can not be repaired as the statement itself is faulty as argued above, in the following we give a correct proof for Theorem 4.7 in [Mo1].

THEOREM 2.8: Let $\mathcal{A}_0$ be also a type-I von-Neumann algebra acting on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0$ with center completely atomic and $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ is given as in Theorem 2.4. Then strong mixing property also implies Kolmogorov's property for $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$. In such a case the following hold:

$$\mathcal{F} =^{\mathrm{def}} \{x : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \tau_t(x)\tau(x^*) = \tau_t(xx^*) : \ t \ge 0\} = I\!\!C$$

PROOF: Separating property of Ω for $\mathcal{A}_0$ ensures that strong mixing property of (S_t) is equivalent to convergence of $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)I$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in weak operator topology for each $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ [AM]. Whereas Kolmogorov property is equivalent to convergence of $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)I$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in strong operator topology. We claim under our assumption on $\mathcal{A}_0$ these two convergence are equivalent. We will make use of dilation described in Theorem 2.1. A direct proof is not visible. As a first step of the proof, we first consider the case where $I\!\!T$ is $Z\!\!\!Z$ i.e. discrete.

We identify $\mathcal{A}_0$ to direct sum $\sum_{k \ge 1} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_k)$ where each $\mathcal{H}_k$ is a complex separable Hilbert space. Let p be a finite dimensional projection on $\mathcal{A}_0$. p being a compact operator, weak convergence of $\tau_n(x)$ ensures that $p\tau_n(x) \rightarrow p\phi(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in strong operator topology. We claim that $j_{-n}(p) \rightarrow \phi(p)|\Omega < \Omega|$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in weak operator topology. The claim follows trivially once we recall by (2.4)

$$< \lambda(\underline{x}), j_{-n}(x)\lambda(\underline{y}) >$$

$$=< j_{m_k}(x_{m_k}) j_{m_{k-1}}(x_{m_{k-1}}) ... j_{m_1}(x_{m_1})\Omega, j_{-n}(x) j_{m_k}(y_{m_k}) j_{m_{k-1}}(y_{m_{k-1}}) ... j_{m_1}(y_{m_1})\Omega >$$

$$=< j_{-n}(I) j_{m_k}(x_{m_k}) ... j_{m_1}(x_{m_1}) j_{-n}(I)\Omega, j_{-n}(x) j_{-n}(I) j_{m_k}(y_{m_k}) ... j_{m_1}(y_{m_1}) j_{-n}(I)\Omega >$$

$$=< j_{-n}(x')\Omega, j_{-n}(x) j_{-n}(y')\Omega >$$

$$= \phi(\tau_{m_1+n}(x'^*) x \tau_{m_1+n}(y'))$$

where finite support of $\underline{x}, \underline{y}$ is $(m_1, m_2, ..., m_k)$ and $n \geq -m_1$ with elements $x' = x_{m_1}\tau_{m_2-m_1}(x_{m-2}\tau_{m_3-m_2}(.....))$ and $y' = y_{m_1}\tau_{m_2-m_1}(y_{m-2}\tau_{m_3-m_2}(.....))$ respectively.

Let $\{p_k : k \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of finite dimensional increasing projections in $\mathcal{H}_1$ so that $p_k \to I$ as $k \to \infty$ in strong operator topology (such a sequence exists as $\mathcal{A}_0$ is type-I with center completely atomic). We claim that there exists a sub-sequence $n_k : k \geq 1$ of natural numbers so that

$$j_{-n_k}(p_k) \to |\Omega >< \Omega|$$

as $n \to \infty$ in strong operator topology. It is enough if we show convergence in weak operator topology as limit is also a projection.

Fix any vector $f \in \mathcal{H}$ i.e. in the dilated space described in Theorem 2.1. For each k, $j_{-n}(p_k) \to \phi(p_k)|\Omega < \Omega|$ in weak operator topology as $n \to \infty$, we can subtract a sub-sequence $n_k(f) : k \geq 1$ so that $< f, |\Omega >< \Omega| f > - < f, j_{-n_k(f)}(p_k) f > \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. We can extract a sub-sequence independent of the vector f by fixing a countable dense subset for $\mathcal{H}$ and apply Cantor's method first to get a sub-sequence n_k such that $< f, |\Omega >< \Omega| - j_{-n_k}(p_k) f > \to 0$ for all f in a countable dense set for $\mathcal{H}$, which is separable as $\mathcal{H}_0$ is so (Proposition 2.7 (a)). Since the family of operators involved are uniformly bounded, we conclude that $j_{-n_k}(p_k) \to |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in weak and so strong operator topology.

We recall $Q = s.\lim_{n \to \infty} F_{-n]}$ and $Q \ge |\Omega >< \Omega|$. We claim now that $Q = |\Omega >< \Omega|$. Suppose not. Then we will have unite vector $f \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $< f, \Omega >= 0$ and $|f >< f| \le Q$. We claim that there exists a sequence of positive contractive elements $y_n \in \mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ of finite rank such that $j_{-n}(y_n) \to |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as $n \to \infty$ in strong operator topology. To that end we consider the $*$-sub-algebra $\mathcal{A}^F_{[n}$ generated by elements $\{j_m(x) : m \ge n, x \in \mathcal{A}^F_0\}$ where $\mathcal{A}^F_0$ is the $*$-algebra generated be elements of $\mathcal{A}_0$ of finite rank. For any element $X \in \mathcal{A}^F_{[n}$, we have $F_{n]} X F_{n]} \in j_n(\mathcal{A}^F_0)$. Further $\mathcal{A}^F_{[n}$ is dense in $\mathcal{A}_{[n}$ in $\sigma-$weak operator topology follows by normal property of complete positive map τ and ϕ.

Since $\vee_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{A}_{[n} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we can use Kaplansky's density theorem to get positive contractive elements $Y_n \in \mathcal{A}^F_{[-n}$ so that $Y_n \to |f >< f|$ as $n \to \infty$ in strong operator topology. We set $y_n \in \mathcal{A}_0$ so that $j_{-n}(y_n) = F_{-n]} Y_n F_{-n]}$ and check that $j_{-n}(y_n) \to Q|f >< f|Q = |f >< f|$ in strong operator topology. By our construction, we have $y_n \in \mathcal{A}^F_0$. Let p_k be the support projection of the elements $\sum_{1 \le m \le k} y_m$. So in particular each p_k is a finite rank projection and $y_k = y_k p_k$.

But $j_{-n_k}(y_k) = j_{-n_k}(y_k p_{n_k}) = j_{-n_k}(y_k) j_{-n_k}(p_{n_k})$ where we have used $n_k \ge k$ by our construction for $p_{n_k} \ge p_k$ and taking strong operator limit on both side we get $|f >< f| = |f >< f||\Omega >< \Omega| = 0$. This brings a contradiction. This completes the proof when $\mathbb{T}$ is discrete i.e. $\mathbb{Z}$.

For continuous case we note by Kadison-Schwarz inequality $\tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) \le \tau_t(x^*x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and so $\phi_0(\tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x)) \le \phi_0(x^*x)$ by invariance of the state. In particular we have $\phi_0(\tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x)) \le \phi_0(\tau_s(x^*)\tau_t(x))$ for all $t \ge s \ge 0$. So in order to prove $\phi_0(\tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x)) \to |\phi_0(x)|^2$ as $t \to \infty$, it is enough if we show $\phi_0(\tau_{tn}(x^*)\tau_{tn}(x)) \to |\phi(x)|^2$ as $n \to \infty$ for some fixed $t > 0$. This completes the proof for $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}$.

That $\mathcal{F}$ is trivial von-Neumann algebra follows as Kolmogorov's property says now $\phi_0(x^*x) = |\phi_0(x)|^2$ for all $x \in \mathcal{F}$ and ϕ_0 being faithful $x = \phi_0(x)I$. ■

The following result is a stronger version of a result obtained in [Mo3].

THEOREM 2.9: Let $\mathcal{A}_0$ be also a factor as in Proposition 2.7. If $\psi_{[-\infty}$ is pure then $\mathcal{A}_0$ is not a type-II factor.

PROOF: We need to rule out the possibility for $\mathcal{A}_0$ to be type-II factor. If so then we fix a finite projection say p in $\mathcal{A}_0$ and j_0 being a faithful representation $j_0(p)$ is a finite projection in $\mathcal{A}_{[-t}$ for each $t \geq 0$. Now consider the nested family of increasing type-II_1 factors $\{\mathcal{M}_t = j_0(p)\mathcal{A}_{[-t}j_0(p) : t \geq 0\}$. By uniqueness of normal trace on a semi-finite von-Neumann algebra [Di,chapter 4] we get a normal tracial state on $\mathcal{M} = \vee_{t \geq 0}\mathcal{M}_t$. However by Markov property we have $j_0(p)(\vee_{t\geq 0}\mathcal{A}_{[-t})j_0(p) = \mathcal{M}$. Thus by purity $\mathcal{M}$ is equal to the set of all bounded operators on $j_0(p)$. Thus $j_0(p)$ and so p is a finite dimensional subspace. This contradicts our starting assumption that $p \neq 0$ and is a finite projection in a type II factor. ■

THEOREM 2.10: [Mo2] Let $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ be as in Theorem 2.1 with ϕ_0 as faithful. The center of $\mathcal{A}_{[t}$ is isomorphic with $\mathcal{A}_0$ and for each $x \in \mathcal{A}_0 \bigcap \mathcal{A}_0'$ the map $\lambda \rightarrow i_t(x)\lambda$ extends to an unital $*$-isomomorphism $k_t : \mathcal{Z}_0 = \mathcal{A}_0 \bigcap \mathcal{A}_0' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{[t} \bigcap \mathcal{A}_{[t}'$. Furthermore $\{k_t(x) : x \in \mathcal{Z}_0,\ t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a commutative family.

PROOF: For (a) we refer to Proposition 3.7 in [Mo2]. That $k_t(x)$ is a well defined isometry for an isometry $x \in \mathcal{Z}_0$ as commuting property of x with any element in $\mathcal{A}_0$ will ensure by (2.1) that $\lambda \rightarrow i_t(x)\lambda$ is inner product preserving. For an arbitrary element $x \in \mathcal{Z}_0$, we extend by linearity decomposing x into isometric elements. It is obvious that $k_t(x) \in \mathcal{A}'_{[t} \bigcap (\mathcal{A}^b_{t]})'$. Hence by Haag duality (Theorem 3.2 (a)) we get $k_t(x)$ is an element in the center of $\mathcal{A}_{[t}$. It is clearly one to one and unital. We are left to show it's onto property. Let X be an element in the center of $\mathcal{A}_{[t}$. By (2.7) i.e. $F_{t]}\mathcal{A}_{[t}F_{t]} = j_t(\mathcal{A}_0)$ we have $F_{t]}XF_{t]} = j_t(x)$ for some $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$. $Xj_t(y) = j_t(y)X$ for all $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ also says that $F_{t]}Xj_t(y)F_{t]} = F_{t]}j_t(y)XF_{t]}$ for all $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and so $j_t(xy) = j_t(yx)$ for all $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$. j_t being injective we get that $x \in \mathcal{Z}_0$. Thus we conclude that $XF_{t]} = j_t(x) = k_t(x)F_{t]}$ for some x in the center of $\mathcal{A}_0$. Now we use cyclic property of Ω for $\mathcal{A}_{[t} \vee \mathcal{A}^b_{t]}$ to conclude that $X = k_t(x)$. That the family is commutative follows once we note that $\mathcal{A}_{[t} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{[s}$ for all $s \leq t$ and also $k_t(x), k_s(y)$ are elements in the center of $\mathcal{A}_{[t}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{[s}$ respectively. ■

Thus the center $\mathcal{Z}_0$ determines a commutative von-Neumann algebra $\mathcal{C} = \{k_r(x) : x \in \mathcal{Z}_0,\ r \in I\!R\}''$ and $x \in \mathcal{Z}_0 \rightarrow k_t(x)$ is a stationary classical process. Let $E_{s]} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{s]}$ be the norm one projection on the commutative sub-algebra $\mathcal{C}_{s]} = \{k_r(x) : x \in \mathcal{Z}_0,\ r \leq s\}$ of $\mathcal{C}$. The question that we are facing now: Is $\{k_t(x) : x \in \mathcal{Z}_0\}$ a Markov process? In the present framework we say (k_t) is a Markov process if $E_{s]}[k_t(x)] \in k_s(\mathcal{Z}_0)$.

One would be tempted to answer affirmatively. In the following text we investigate in details this delicate property. If $E_{s]}[k_t(x)] \in k_s(\mathcal{Z}_0)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{Z}_0$ and $s \leq t$ then we could write $E_{s]}[k_t(x)] = k_s(p_{s,t}(x))$ for some element $p_{s,t}(x)$ determined uniquely by x as k_s is an injective map. By stationary property we also have $p_{s,t}(x) = p_{s+r,t+r}(x)$ for any $r \in I\!\!T$ and $s \leq t$. Thus we can write $p_{s,t}(x) = p_{t-s}(x)$ for some positive unital map $p_t : \mathcal{Z}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_0$, where $t \geq 0$. Further as $E_{0]}E_{s]} = E_{0]}$ for any $s \geq 0$, we also get $k_0(p_t(x)) = E_{0]}[k_t(x)] = E_{0]}E_{s]}[k_t(x)] = k_0(p_sp_{t-s}(x))$ and so $p_t = p_sp_{t-s}$ on $\mathcal{Z}_0$. Thus $(p_t :\ t \geq 0)$ is a semi-group of unital positive map on $\mathcal{Z}_0$ where $p_0 = 1$. For any $t \geq 0$ and

$x, y \in \mathcal{Z}_0$ we also have

$$\phi_0(xp_t(y)) =< \Omega, k_0(x)k_t(y)\Omega >=< \Omega, j_0(x)j_t(y)\Omega >= \phi_0(x\tau_t(y))$$

and thus

$$p_t(y) = E_{\mathcal{Z}_0}[\tau_t(y)] \tag{2.6}$$

where $E_{\mathcal{Z}_0}$ is the norm one projection from $\mathcal{A}_0$ to its center $\mathcal{Z}_0$. Such a conditional expectation exists [Ta,AcC] as the center remains invariant by an automorphism, in particular by the modular automorphism group associated with the faithful normal state ϕ_0. Thus simplest situation when τ commutes with $E_{\mathcal{Z}_0}$, k_t is a Markov process. Otherwise the necessary condition, that the maps $x \to E_{\mathcal{Z}_0}\tau_t(x)$ is a one parameter semi-group, is not evident. This suggest that the problem is far from being simple. In the following we include a sufficient condition.

THEOREM 2.11: Let $\mathcal{A}_0' = \mathcal{Z}_0$ then $k_t : \mathcal{Z}_0 \to \mathcal{C}$ defined in Theorem 2.10 is a classical Markov process.

PROOF: By duality relation we have $\phi_0(x\tau_t(y)) = \phi_0(\tau_t'(x)y)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0'$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and as $\mathcal{A}_0' = \mathcal{Z}_0$ we get $\phi_0(x\tau_t(y)) = (xp_t(y))$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{Z}_0$ where $p_t : \mathcal{Z}_0 \to \mathcal{Z}_0$ is a unital positive map. Thus by repeating the above steps, we also have

$$\phi_0(x_1^*\tau_{t_2-t_1}(x_2^*\tau_{t_3-t_2}(...\tau_{t_n-t_{n-1}}(x_n^*y_n)...)y_2)y_1)$$

$$= \phi_0(x_1^*p_{t_2-t_1}(x_2^*p_{t_3-t_2}(...p_{t_n-t_{n-1}}(x_n^*y_n)...)y_2)y_1)$$

for all $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $t_1 \le t_2.. \le t_n$. Thus (k_t) is isomorphic to a classical Markov process and so k_t is itself a Markov process and $p_t = E_{\mathcal{Z}_0}\tau_t$ on $\mathcal{Z}_0$ for all $t \ge 0$. ∎

NOTES AND REMARKS 2.12: It is obvious that $Q \ge Q_0$ and Kolmogorov's criteria is a sufficient condition for purity. The unique ground state for XY model gives an example where $Q_0 = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ but $Q = I$ [AMa] as $F_{0]} = I$. We avoid giving details here and in Appendix we gave an out line of the proof. Further the counter example shows that Theorem 3.4 ((b) implies (a)) in [Mo2] has a faulty proof as it is not enough to show $\Delta^{\frac{1}{4}}\tau_t(x)\Omega \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\Omega$ in strong topology to ensure $\tau_t(x)\Omega \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\Omega$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ strong topology and such a statement appears in [Mo1] with a faulty proof. As a consequence proof given for Theorem 3.5 ((c) implies (a) or (b)) in [Mo2] is as well faulty and such a statement is false. Thus Theorem 2.4 here can be regarded as the modified correct form. Nevertheless this give rises to the old problem whether Kolmogorov's property is time reversible [Mo1] i.e. Does $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)1$ in strong operator topology for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ if and only if $\tilde{\tau}_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)I$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$? Same question for weak Kolmogorov's property which is false. For a counter example consider the canonical trace ω_0 on $\mathcal{B}_0 = \otimes_{I\!N} M_d(I\!\!C)$ which keeps right translation θ on $\mathcal{B}_0$ invariant. Since the induced endomorphism τ associated with translation θ on the GNS space $\tau^n(\pi_{\omega_0})(\mathcal{B}_0) = \pi_{\omega_0}(\mathcal{B}_0) \bigcap \pi_{\omega_0}(\mathcal{B}_0)' = I\!\!C$ by factor property of ω_0, we have $||\psi\tau_n - \phi_0|| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all normal state ψ on $\pi_{\omega_0}(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ by Arveson's criteria [Ar] for Power's shift where ϕ_0 is the faithful normal state in the GNS space induced by ω_0. Thus the dual Markov map of $(\phi_{\omega_0}(\mathcal{B}_0)'', \tau, \phi_0)$ admits weak-Kolmogorov's property by Theorem 2.4 (by interchanging the role of τ and $\tilde{\tau}$).

In case $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a commutative von-Neumann algebra both weak Kolmogorov and Kolmogorov's property coincides as modular operator is trivial and the argument used in the faulty proof given for Theorem 3.4 in [Mo2] goes through due to triviality of modular operator. On the other hand weak Kolmogorov property of (τ_t) implies in particular $\tilde{\tau}_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$ in weak operator topology and so by duality $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$ in weak operator topology as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This shows strong mixing is a weaker notion then weak Kolmogorov property and we have following order:

Ergodic << Weakly mixing << Strongly mixing <<

Weakly Kolmogorov=Purity << Kolmogorov

In case $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a type-I factor, strong mixing implies Kolmogorov's property by Theorem 2.8. Further we recall Theorem 2.5 in [Mo2] that when $I\!\!T = I\!\!R$, i.e. continuous time, all above notions coincides once $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a type-I factor. In a forth coming paper [Mo7] we will deal with such a situation with $\mathcal{A}_0$ as a type-I factor in greater details and find it's relation with complete boolean algebra of type-I factors [AraW] and associated product systems [Ar2,Po3].

3 Pure inductive limit state:

Let $\mathcal{B}_0$ be a C^* algebra, $(\lambda_t: \; t \ge 0)$ be a semi-group of injective endomorphisms and ψ be an invariant state for $(\lambda_t : t \ge 0)$. We extend (λ_t) to an automorphism on the C^* algebra $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ of the inductive limit

$$\mathcal{B}_0 \rightarrow^{\lambda_t} \mathcal{B}_0 \rightarrow^{\lambda_t} \mathcal{B}_0$$

and extend also the state ψ to $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ by requiring (λ_t) invariance. Thus there exists a directed set (i.e. indexed by $I\!\!T$, by inclusion $\mathcal{B}_{[-s} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{[-t}$ if and only if $t \ge s$) of C*-subalgebras $\mathcal{B}_{[t}$ of $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ so that the uniform closure of $\bigcup_{s \in I\!\!T} \mathcal{B}_{[s}$ is $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$. Moreover there exists an isomorphism

$$i_0 : \mathcal{B}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{[0}$$

(we refer [Sa] for general facts on inductive limit of C*-algebras). It is simple to note that $i_t = \lambda_t \circ i_0$ is an isomorphism of $\mathcal{B}_0$ onto $\mathcal{B}_{[t}$ and

$$\psi_{-\infty} i_t = \psi$$

on $\mathcal{B}_0$. Let $(\mathcal{H}_\pi, \pi, \Omega)$ be the GNS space associated with $(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}, \psi_{[-\infty})$ and (λ_t) be the unique normal extension to $\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})''$. Thus the vector state $\psi_\Omega(X) =< \Omega, X\Omega >$ is an invariant state for automorphism (λ_t). As $\lambda_t(\mathcal{B}_{[0}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{[0}$ for all $t \ge 0$, $(\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})'', \lambda_t,\ t \ge 0, \psi_\Omega)$ is a quantum dynamics of endomorphisms. Let $F_{t]}$ be the support projection of the normal vector state Ω in the von-Neumann sub-algebra $\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[t})''$. $F_{t]} \in \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[t})'' \subseteq \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})''$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence of projections as $t \to -\infty$. Let projection Q be the limit. Thus $Q \ge [\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})'\Omega] \ge |\Omega >< \Omega|$. So $Q = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ ensures that ψ on $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$ is pure. We aim to investigate when Q is pure i.e. $Q = |\Omega >< \Omega|$.

To that end we set von-Neumann algebra $\mathcal{N}_0 = F_{0]}\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})''F_{0]}$ and define family $\{k_t : \mathcal{N}_0 \to \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty})'',\ t \in I\!\!T\}$ of $*-$homomorphisms by

$$k_t(x) = \lambda_t(F_{0]}xF_{0]}),\ \ x \in \mathcal{N}_0$$

It is a routine work to check that $(k_t : t \in I\!\!T)$ is the unique up to isomorphism (in the cyclic space of the vector Ω generated by the von-Neumann algebra $\{k_t(x) : t \in I\!\!T, x \in \mathcal{N}_0\}$) forward weak Markov process associated with $(\mathcal{N}_0, \eta_t, \psi_0)$ where $\eta_t(x) = F_{0]}\lambda_t(F_{0]}xF_{0]})F_{0]}$ for all $t \ge 0$. It is minimal once restricted to the cyclic space generated by the process. Thus $Q = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ when restricted to the cyclic subspace of the process if and only if $\psi_0(\eta_t(x)\eta_t(y)) \to \psi_0(x)\psi_0(y)$ as $t \to \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{N}_0$.

PROPOSITION 3.1: Let $G_{0]}$ be the cyclic subspace of the vector Ω generated by $\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})''$.

(a) $G_{0]} \in \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})'$ and the map $h : \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})'' \to G_{0]}\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})''G_{0]}$ defined by $X \to G_{0]}XG_{0]}$ is an homomorphism and the range is isomorphic to $\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''$, where $(\mathcal{H}_{\pi_0}, \pi_0)$ is the GNS space associated with $(\mathcal{B}_0, \psi)$.

(b) Identifying the range of h with $\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ we have

$$h \circ \lambda_t(X) = \lambda_t(h(X))$$

for all $X \in \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})''$ and $t \geq 0$.

(c) Let P be the support projection of the state ψ in von-Neumann algebra $\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = P\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''P$. We set $\tau_t(x) = P\lambda_t(PxP)P$ for all $t \geq 0,\ x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $\psi_0(x) = \psi(PxP)$ for $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Then

(i) $h(F_{0]}) = P$ and $h(\mathcal{N}_0) = \mathcal{A}_0$;

(ii) $h(\eta_t(x)) = \tau_t(h(x))$ for all $t \geq 0$.

PROOF: The map $\pi(X)\Omega \rightarrow \pi_0(X)\Omega_0$ has an unitary extension which intertwines the GNS representation $(\mathcal{H}_0, \pi_0)$ with the sub-representation of $\mathcal{B}_{[0}$ on the cyclic subspace $G_{0]}$. Thus (a) follows. (b) is a simple consequence as $i_0 : \mathcal{B}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{[0}$ is a C^* isomorphism which co-variant with respect to (λ_t) for all $t \geq 0$ i.e $\lambda_t i_0(x) = i_0(\lambda_t(x))$ for all $x \in \mathcal{B}_0$. That $h(F_{0]}) = P$ is simple as h is an isomorphism and thus also a normal map taking support projection $F_{0]}$ of the state ψ in $\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})''$ to support projection P of the state ψ in $\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''$. Now by homomorphism property of the map h and commuting property with (λ_t) we also check that $h(\mathcal{N}_0) = h(F_{0]}\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[0})''F_{0]}) = P\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''P = \mathcal{A}_0$ and

$$h(\eta_t(x)) = h(F_{0]})\lambda_t(h(F_{0]})h(x)h(F_{0]}))$$

$$= P\lambda_t(Ph(x)P)P = \tau_t(h(x))$$

for all $t \geq 0$. ■

THEOREM 3.2: $\psi_{[-\infty}$ is a pure state if and only if for each $t \geq 0$, there exists contractive elements $x_t \in \mathcal{A}_0$ such that for each $s \geq 0$, $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)x^*_{s+t}x_{s+t}\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$.

PROOF: Let Q_0 be the support projection of $\vee_{t \in I\!\!R}\mathcal{A}_{[t}$. Thus $Q_0 \leq Q \leq F_{t]}$ for all $t \in I\!\!R$. For any fix $t \in I\!\!T$ since $k_t(\mathcal{A}_0) = F_{t]}\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[t})''F_{t]}$, for any $X \in \pi(\mathcal{B}_{[t})''$ we have $Q_0X\Omega = Q_0F_{t]}XF_{t]}\Omega = Q_0k_t(x)\Omega$ for some $x \in \mathcal{N}_0$. Hence $Q_0 = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ if and only if $Q_0 = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ on the cyclic subspace generated by $\{k_t(x),\ t \in I\!\!T, x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$. Theorem 2.4 says now that $Q_0 = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ if for each $s \geq 0$ we have $\psi_0(\eta_t(x)x^*_{s+t}x_{s+t}\eta_t(y)) \rightarrow \psi_0(x)\psi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{N}_0$. Since h is a homomorphism and $h\eta_t(x) = \tau_t(h(x))$, we also have $h(\eta_t(x))x^*_{s+t}x_{s+t}\eta_t(y)) = \tau_t(h(x))h(x^*_{s+t})h(x_{s+t})\tau_t(h(x))$. Since $\phi_0 \circ h = \psi_0$ we conclude the "if part" of the statement identifying $\mathcal{A}_0$ with $\mathcal{N}_0$. For the converse we use Kaplansky's density theorem to ensure contractive elements $X_t \in i_{-t}(\mathcal{B}_0)''$ so that $X_t \rightarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in strong operator topology. Now we set $k_{-t}(x_t) = F_{-t]}X_tF_{-t]} \in \mathcal{A}_{[-t}$ and since $k_{-t}(x_t) \rightarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in strong operator topology we have $k_{-t}(x^*_tx_t) \rightarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in weak operator topology. This completes the proof once we compute $< \Omega, k_{-s}(x)k_{-t}(x^*_tx_t)k_{-s}(y)\Omega >= \phi_0(\tau_{t-s}(x^*)x^*_tx_t\tau_{t-s}(y))$ for any $t \geq s$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$. ■

THEOREM 3.3: Q is pure i.e. $(\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}, \psi_{[-\infty})$ is Kolmogorov if and only if $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\psi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$.

PROOF: For any fix $t \in I\!\!T$ since $k_t(\mathcal{A}_0) = F_{t]}\pi(\mathcal{B}_{[t)})''F_{t]}$, for any $X \in \mathcal{B}_{[t}$ we have $QX\Omega = QF_{t]}XF_{t]}\Omega = Qk_t(x)\Omega$ for some $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Hence $Q = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ if and only if $Q = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ on the cyclic subspace generated by $\{k_t(x),\ t \in I\!\!T, x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$. Theorem 3.5 says now that $Q = |\Omega >< \Omega|$ if and only if $\psi_0(\eta_t(x)\eta_t(y)) \rightarrow \psi_0(x)\psi_0(y)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}_0$. Since h is a homomorphism and $h\eta_t(x) = \tau_t(h(x))$, we also have $h(\eta_t(x)\eta_t(y)) = \tau_t(h(x))\tau_t(h(x))$. As $\phi_0 \circ h = \psi_0$ we complete the proof. ■

THEOREM 3.4: Let $(\mathcal{B}_0, \lambda_t : t \geq 0, \psi_0)$ be an unital semi-group of injective endomorphisms and ψ_0 be a factor state. If inductive limit state $\psi_{[-\infty}$ is pure then ψ_0 is either type-I or type-III factor state. In case ψ_0 is type-I then $(\mathcal{B}_0, \lambda_t, t \geq 0, \psi_0)$ admits Kolmogorov's property if and only if $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$ is strongly mixing i.e. $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)I$ in weak operator topology for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$.

PROOF: We set $P\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)''P = \mathcal{A}_0$ where P is the support projection of the state ψ_0 in the GNS space i.e. $P = [\pi_0(\mathcal{B}_0)'\Omega]$. Thus $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a factor of same type. $\psi_{[-\infty}$ being a pure state on $\mathcal{B}_{[-\infty}$, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 3.2 says that $\psi_{[-\infty}$ is also pure on $\mathcal{A}_{[-\infty}$. Thus the result is a simple consequence of Theorem 2.9. The last statement follows by Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 3.3. ■

It is a simple observation that result in section 3 can be extended to a more general set up where directed set [Sa] in the inductive limit sets are more general. As an example we can deal with $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\mathbb{T}_+$ equipped with natural partial ordering. In such a situation the consistence family endomorphisms give rises to d many commuting semi-groups of endomorphisms.

4 A complete invariance for a translation invariant pure state on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ with Kolmogorov's property:

Let $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, ., d\}$ be a finite set with $d \geq 1$ and $p : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \to [0, 1]$ be a transition probability matrix which admits a stationary probability measure $\mu : \mathcal{D} \to [0, 1]$ i.e. $p^i_j \geq 0$, $\sum_j p^i_j = 1$ and $\sum_j \mu_j = 1$, $\sum_i \mu_i p^i_j = \mu_j$. Let $\mathbb{Z}$ be the set of integers and $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be the two sided stationary Markov process or chain defined on a probability space $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_\mu)$ where $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}} = \times_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{D}_n$ is the product set with $\mathcal{D}_n = \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ be the $\sigma-$fields generated by the cylinder subsets of $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $X_n(\zeta) = \zeta_n$ with $\mathcal{P}\{\zeta; X_{n+1}(\zeta) = j | X_n(\zeta) = i\} = p^i_j$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{n]}$ be the $\sigma-$field generated by the Markov process upto time n i.e. $\mathcal{F}_{n]} = \sigma\{X_k : -\infty < k \leq n \text{ are measurable}\}$. Such a Markov process is said to admit Kolmogorov property if $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_{n]} = \{\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \emptyset\}$. Such a Markov process is also called Bernoulli shift if $p^i_j = \mu_j$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{D}$.

Let $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_\mu)$. Let $F_{n]}$ be the orthogonal projection on $L^2(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{F}_{n]}, \mathcal{P}_\mu)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $S_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the right shift unitary operator on $\mathcal{H}$ defined by $S_n f(\zeta) = f(\theta_n(\zeta)),\ f \in \mathcal{H}$ where $\theta_n(\zeta)(k) = \zeta(k-n)$ is the n-shift which preserves the probability measure $\mathcal{P}_\mu$. Thus X_n can be viewed as an element in $L^\infty(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{F}_{n]}, \mathcal{P}_\mu)$ and $\alpha : L^\infty(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_\mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_\mu)$ is an automorphism defined by $\alpha(F)(\zeta) = f(\theta^{-1}(\zeta))$ for $f \in L^\infty(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}_\mu)$ and $\Phi_\mu(f) = \int f d\mathcal{P}_\mu$ is the translation invariant state on the function space on the compact Hausdorff space $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}$ where $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is equipped with product topology and so $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is compact. Thus an invariant state μ and associated translation invariant state Φ_μ exists. We assume further that μ is also faithful i.e. $\mu_j > 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{D}$ to avoid trivial modification in our argument.

It is well known [Pa] that a Bernoulli shift admits Kolmogorov's property and a deeper result in ergodic theory says that the converse is also true i.e. a Markov chain with Kolmogorov's property is strongly isomorphic with a Bernoulli shift. A celebrated result in ergodic theory [Or] says much more giving a complete invariance for such a class of Markov chain in terms of their dynamical entropy $h_\mu(\theta)$ introduced by Kolmogorov-Sinai [Pa] of the shift. However the isomorphism that inter-twins the Kolmogorov's shifts with equal positive dynamical entropy, need not inter-twin the filtration generated by the processes. However one gets finite correlation which we will explain in the following text.

Kolmogorov property is equivalent to $F_{n]} \downarrow P_\Omega$ in strong operator topology as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where P_Ω is the orthogonal projection on constant functions on $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. In such a case the projection $F_{n]} - P_\Omega$ together with shifts S_n restricted to $I - P_\Omega$ give rises to a system of imprimitivity for the group $\mathbb{Z}$ in the sense of G. W. Mackey. So by Mackey theorem $(S_n(I - P_\Omega), F_{n]} - P_\Omega)$ is unitary equivalent to direct sum of copies of standard shifts on $L^2(\mathbb{Z})$. Thus the number of copies that appears in the direct sum is also an invariance for associated imprimitivity system. A natural question: how this new invariance which inter-twins filtration is related to Kolmogorov-Sinai's invariance of dynamical entropy which may not preserve filtration? We will prove that these two invariance rather then competing with each other they are complementing each other as invariance for the shift.

Let $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ be the uniformly hyper-finite C^*-algebra over the lattice $\mathbb{Z}$, where $M_d(\mathbb{C})$ be the $d \times d$-matrices over complex field $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_R = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_+} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathcal{B}_L = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_-} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ be one-sided C^*-sub-algebra of $\mathcal{B}$. For a state ω on $\mathcal{B}$, we set $\omega_R = \omega_{|}\mathcal{B}_R$ and $\omega_L = \omega_{|}\mathcal{B}_L$. A state ω on $\mathcal{B}$ is called translation invariant if $\omega(x) = \omega(\theta(x))$ where θ is the translation induced by $n \to n+1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The product Bernoulli state $\mu_\infty = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mu$ on $C(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}})$ has several Hann-Banach translation invariant extension to $\mathcal{B}$ where $C(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}})$ is viewed as a C^*-sub-algebra consists of product of diagonal matrices in $\mathcal{B}$ with respect to an orthonormal basis (e_i) for $\mathbb{C}^d$. Let ρ be a state on M_d so that $\rho(|e_j >< e_j|) = \mu_j$. One trivial possibility is to take $\rho(|e_i >< e_j|) = \delta^i_j \mu_j$. In such a case ρ is not a pure state unless $\mu_j = 1$ for some $j \in \mathcal{D}$ and associated product state on $\mathcal{B}$ includes in particular canonical tracial state on $\mathcal{B}$ for a suitable choice namely $\mu_j = \frac{1}{d}$. Otherwise we will have type-III$_\lambda$ factor for $\lambda \in (0,1)$ [Po]. In general we can choose a Hann-Banach extension of the Bernoulli measure to a product state on $\mathcal{B}$ so that it's mean entropy takes values a prescribed number between 0 and $\sum_j -\mu_j ln(\mu_j)$. One can choose a unit vector $\lambda = (\lambda_j)$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and set pure state $\rho_\lambda(|e_i >< e_j) = \bar{\lambda}_i \lambda_j$ where $\mu_j = |\lambda_j|^2$. Associated product states $\omega_\lambda = \otimes \rho_\lambda$ is a pure state. A translation invariant state ω on $\mathcal{B}$ is said to be

Bernoulli if ω is a product state and pure on $\mathcal{B}$. Such a Bernoulli state on $\mathcal{B}$ is equal to ω_λ for some unit vector $\lambda \in I\!\!C$. It is a simple observation that two such pure product states give rises to isomorphic translation dynamics.

Let ω be as before a translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B}$ and E be the support projection of ω in $\pi(\mathcal{B}_R)''$ in the GNS space $(\mathcal{H}_\pi, \pi, \Omega)$ associated with $(\mathcal{B}, \omega)$ and set $E_{n]} = \theta^n(E)$ for all $n \in Z\!\!\!Z$. So $\theta^n(E)$ is the support projection of ω in $\pi(\theta^n(\mathcal{B}_R))''$ and thus $E_{n]} \le E_{n+1]}$. We say ω admits Kolmogorov's property if $E_{n]} \downarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in strong operator topology as $n \downarrow -\infty$ [Mo2]. In such a case restriction of $(S_n, E_{n]})$ on $|\Omega >< \Omega|^\perp = I - |\Omega >< \Omega|$ give rises to a Mackey system of imprimitivity for the group $Z\!\!\!Z$ and $I_{\mathcal{H}} \ominus |\Omega >< \Omega|$ can decomposed into copies of $l^2(Z\!\!\!Z)$ and restriction of S_n is isomorphic to the standard shift. We say number of copies that appear in the decomposition as Mackey's index for ω which are assumed to admit Kolmogorov's property. A simple consequence of the main result in section 3 shows that Bernoulli state admits Kolmogorov's property. Any translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B}$ with Kolmogorov's property is pure. However a pure may not in general admit Kolmogorov's property as we pointed out indication an example in section 6. A translation invariant pure states with $\pi(\mathcal{B}_L)''$ as type-I factor admits Kolmogorov's property by Theorem 2.7. A valid question: When does a translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B}$ unitary equivalent to a Bernoulli state on $\mathcal{B}$ intertwining the shifts? In the following text we formulate the problem precisely and state our main results of this section and compute it's Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy [NeS] indirectly.

Let $(\mathcal{B}_k, \theta_k, \omega_k)$ with $k = 1, 2$ be two C^*-dynamical systems where $\mathcal{B}_k$ are C^*-algebras and $\theta_k : \mathcal{B}_k \to \mathcal{B}_k$ are automorphisms preserving state ω_k respectively. Let $\Theta_k : \pi_k(\mathcal{B}_k)'' \to \pi_k(\mathcal{B}_k)''$ be the associated automorphisms where $(\mathcal{H}_k, \pi_k, \Omega_k)$ are GNS spaces for $(\mathcal{B}_k, \theta_k, \omega_k)$, $k = 1, 2$. The C^*-dynamical systems $(\mathcal{B}_1,\theta_1,\omega_1)$ and $(\mathcal{B}_2,\theta_2,\omega_2)$ are said to be unitary equivalent as a dynamical system if there exists an unitary operator $U : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ so that $U\Theta_1(X)U^* = \Theta_2(UXU^*)$ for all $X \in \pi_1(\mathcal{B}_1)''$. If we replace $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2$ by $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ in above unitary equivalence we get back to notion of strong equivalence in Kolmogorov-Sinai-Ornstein theory for classical dynamics. For last few decades serious attempt has been made to introduce a suitable notion of dynamical entropy valid for quantum dynamics governed by automorphisms either on a C^*-algebra or von-Neumann algebra. Here we recall Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy [NeS] for a translation invariant product state is equal to the mean entropy. Thus in particular Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy for a Bernoulli state is zero. On the other hand a translation invariant state with Kolmogorov property is always pure on $\mathcal{B}$ and Bernoulli state admits Kolmogorov property. Thus the notion of Bernoulli state retains Kolmogorov's property at the cost of making Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy [NeS] which is equal to mean entropy (being a product state) to be zero.

PROPOSITION 4.1: Let ω be a translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ with Kolmogorov's property. Then it's Mackey index of shift with respect to filtration generated by $E = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)'\Omega]$ is equal to $\aleph_0$. Same holds filtration generated by the projection $F = [\pi(\mathcal{B}_L)''\Omega]$.

PROOF: Let E be the support projection of ω in $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)''$ where $(\mathcal{H},\pi,\Omega)$ is the GNS space associated with the state ω on $\mathcal{B}$,i.e. $E = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)'\Omega]$. By Haag duality [Mo4] we also have $E = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)'\Omega] = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_L)''\Omega]$ and so $\theta(E) = [\pi_\omega(\theta(\mathcal{B}_L))''\Omega]$. We claim that $\theta(E)-E$ is infinite dimensional. That $\theta(E)-E \neq 0$ follows as $\theta^n(E) \uparrow I$ as $n \uparrow \infty$ and $\theta^n(E) \downarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as $n \downarrow -\infty$. We choose a unit vector $f \in \theta(E) - E$ and thus in particular $f \perp \Omega$ since $\theta(E)\Omega = \Omega$. We set temporary notation $F = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)'f]$ and note that $F \subseteq \theta(E)$ as $\mathcal{B}_L \subseteq \theta(\mathcal{B}_L)$

and $F \perp E$ as $f \perp \Omega$. Thus $F \le \theta(E) - E$. We claim that F is an infinite dimensional subspace as otherwise we find a finite dimensional representation of $\mathcal{B}_R$ on F by restricting the representation π of $\mathcal{B}_L$ to F. That contradicts simplicity of $\mathcal{B}_L$ as a C^*-algebra.

The proof uses Haag duality property but one may as well get a proof of Proposition 4.1 without using it as follows. Since proof given for Haag duality in [Mo4] is not yet published and proof given in [KMSW] is faulty (see [Ma3] for comments on it), in the following we use filtration generated by F to give an alternative proof.

Let E be the support projection of ω as before in $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)''$ in the GNS space i.e. $E = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_R)'\Omega]$ and $F = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_L)''\Omega]$. $F \le E$ as $F \ominus |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as well give rises to a system of imprimitivity with action of translation i.e. $\theta(F) \ge F$ and $\theta^n(F) \uparrow I$ by cyclic property of the GNS representation and $0 \le \theta^n(F) \le \theta^n(E) \downarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as $n \downarrow -\infty$. Thus the Mackey systems generated by the projection $F - |\Omega >< \Omega|$ by shift is of index $\aleph_0$. ■

THEOREM 4.2: Two translation invariant states on $\mathcal{B}$ with Kolmogorov's property gives isomorphic shift on $\mathcal{B}$.

PROOF: It is a simple consequence of Mackey's theorem [Mac] as their Mackey indices with F are equal to $\aleph_0$ by Proposition 4.1. ■

THEOREM 4.3: Let ω be a translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B}$ with Kolmogorov's property. Then $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega)$ is unitary equivalent to a Bernoulli dynamics $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega_\lambda)$ where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is a unit vector.

PROOF: A Bernoulli state on $\mathcal{B}$ admits Kolmogorov's property and thus it is a simple case of Theorem 4.2. ■

Thus in contrast to classical situation and Connes-Størmer's theory of Bernoulli shifts we have the following.

THEOREM 4.4: Let $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega)$ be as in Theorem 4.3. Then $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega)$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \theta^k, \omega)$ are isomorphic as dynamics and Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy $h_{CS}(\omega)$ of ω is zero.

PROOF: By Theorem 4.2 $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega)$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \theta^k, \omega)$ are isomorphic dynamics as both admits Kolmogorov's property and their Mackey index are equal to $\aleph_0$. That Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy is zero follows once we use the isomorphism to translation dynamics with a Bernoulli state on $\mathcal{B}$. ■

We note that the inter-twiner $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ between the two dynamics $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega)$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \theta^2, \omega)$ does not preserves local algebra $\mathcal{B}_{loc}$ where $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \omega)$ is the GNS space. This feature in a sense is a deviation from what we get in an isomorphism map between two compact Hausdorff spaces representing Bernoulli or Markov shifts [Or]. Thus this feature is a deviation of our intuition of classical spin chain. A family of classical Bernoulli states with entropy between 0 and $ln(d)$ are embedded continuously into a Bernoulli state ω_λ on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_d(\mathbb{C})$ and Kolmogorov-Sinai dynamical entropy is a complete invariance to determine translation invariant maximal abelian von-Neumann sub-algebra upto isomorphism.

It is already known [NeS] that Connes-Størmer dynamical entropy is zero for a pure translation invariant state. In general for a translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B}$, $h_{CS}(\omega) \le s(\omega)$, where $s(\omega)$ is the mean entropy. One of the standing conjecture in the subject about equality. In particular it is not known yet whether $s(\omega)$ is zero for a translation invariant pure state. As a first step towards the conjecture it seems worth to investigate this question for such a state with Kolmogorov's property. Note that mean entropy is yet to be interpreted as an invariance for the shift! However it is not hard to verify mean entropy of translation invariant states ω_1, ω_2 remain same if $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega_1)$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega_2)$ are isomorphic provided the isomorphism preserves the local algebras $\mathcal{B}_{loc} = \bigcup_{\Lambda:|\Lambda|<\infty} \mathcal{B}_\Lambda$.

Now we conclude this section comparing isomorphic class in quantum situation with that of classical situation studied by [Or]. Any isomorphism between the space of continuous functions on two compact Hausdorff Bernoulli spaces $\mathcal{D}_d^{\mathbb{Z}} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_d$ and $\mathcal{D}_{d'}^{\mathbb{Z}} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_{d'}$ with product topology is local i.e. any set $E \in \mathcal{D}_d^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with finite support i.e. cylinder set gets mapped by the isomorphism to a set with finite support in $\mathcal{D}_{d'}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ i.e. a cylinder set since a compact set goes to a compact set which can be covered by finitely many open sets of finite support since union over sets with finite support is a cover for any set. Besides the isomorphism local, we can use covariance relation with respect to translation action to conclude that isomorphism takes $\mathcal{F}_{n]}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{n+k]}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ for some fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Similarly it takes backward filtration $\mathcal{F}_{[n}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{[n+k'}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ for some $k' \in \mathbb{Z}$.

On the other hand an isomorphism on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes M_d(\mathbb{C})$ need not be local and the class of isomorphism makes two Bernoulli dynamics $(\mathcal{B}, \theta, \omega_\lambda)$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \theta^2, \omega_\lambda)$ isomorphic! We have explored this contrast and it's property further with a new notion of quantum dynamical entropy [Mo6] which is not same as Connes-Størmer [NeS] dynamical entropy.

5 Quantum spin chain in higher dimensional lattices

We end this paper with a brief discussion and results on quantum spin chain on lattice $\mathbb{Z}_k : k \geq 2$ of higher dimension. Unlike one dimensional lattice which is a totally ordered lattice, higher dimensional lattices lacks a clear picture so far how to describe analogue properties such as finitely correlated states [FNW1,FNW2] or quantum Markov state [Ac1,Ac2]. Same difficulties one will also face if one tries to define a kernel on the set of functions on $\mathbb{Z}_k$ with finite supports along the line of the situation of one-dimension lattice $\mathbb{Z}$. However in the following we still arrive results along the same line for strong mixing, purity, Kolmogorov's etc property of a translation invariant state on quantum spin chain on higher dimensional lattice.

Rather then dealing with a more general C^*-algebraic frame work, we investigate translation invariant states on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^k} M_d^{\underline{n}}(\mathbb{C})$ where $\mathbb{Z}^k = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} .. \times \mathbb{Z}$ -k-dimensional lattice and for each $\underline{n} = (n_1, n_2, .., n_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, $M_d^{\underline{n}}(\mathbb{C})$ is a copy of $M_d(\mathbb{C})$, $d \geq 2$. $\mathcal{B}$ is also the inductive limit C^* algebra of the commuting endomorphism of shifts in positive direction of each axis on $\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}} = \otimes_{\underline{n} \geq \underline{0}} M_d^{\underline{n}}(\mathbb{C})$ where we say $\underline{n} \geq \underline{m}$ if $n_i \geq m_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Let ω be a translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B}$ and $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ be the associated GNS space. Let E be the support projection of ω in $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$ i.e. $E = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})'\Omega]$. Invariance property will ensure that $\omega(E\theta_{\underline{n}}(I - E)E) = 0$ and for all $\underline{n} \geq \underline{0}$, $\theta_{\underline{n}}(E)$ being an element in $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$, we conclude that $E\theta_{\underline{n}}(I - E)E = 0$ and so $\theta_{\underline{n}}(E) \geq E$ for all $\underline{n} \geq \underline{0}$. ω is said to be *Kolmogorov* if $\theta_{\underline{n}}(E) \downarrow |\Omega >< \Omega|$ as $\underline{n} \downarrow -\underline{\infty}$.

Let $(\mathcal{H}_{\underline{0}}, \pi_{\omega_{\underline{0}}}, \Omega_{\underline{0}})$ be the GNS space associated with $(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}}, \omega_{\underline{0}})$ where $\omega_{\underline{0}}$ is the restriction of ω to $\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}}$ and P be the support projection of $\omega_{\underline{0}}$ in $\pi_{\omega_{\underline{0}}}(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$ i.e. $P = [\pi_{\omega_{\underline{0}}}(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})'\Omega_{\underline{0}}]$. Once more we will have sub-normal property $\theta_{\underline{n}}(P) \geq P$ for all $\underline{n} \geq \underline{0}$ and $P\theta_{\underline{n}}(X)P = P\theta_{\underline{n}}(PXP)P$ for all $X \in \pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$ and $\underline{n} \geq \underline{0}$. We also set

$$\tau_{\underline{n}}(x) = P\theta_{\underline{n}}(PxP)P$$

for all $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^k_+$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ which we take as the corner von-Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}_0 = P\pi_{\omega_{\underline{0}}}(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''P$. Note also that $\tau_{\underline{n}} = \tau^1_{n_1}..\tau^k_{n_k}$ where $\{\tau^r : 1 \leq r \leq k\}$ is a commuting family of unital completely positive normal maps on $\mathcal{A}_0$ determined by the semi-group of endomorphisms with respect to standard basis vectors of the lattice. Commuting property follows from commuting property of endomorphism and sub-normal property of P.

The GNS space $(\mathcal{H}_{\underline{0}}, \pi_{\omega_{\underline{0}}}, \Omega_{\underline{0}})$ is isomorphic to sub-representation $(\mathcal{H}_{[\underline{0}}, \pi_\omega, \Omega)$ where $\mathcal{H}_{[\underline{0}} = [\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})\Omega]$ and $\pi_\omega : \mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}} \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{[\underline{0}})$ is the restriction of the representation π_ω on $\mathcal{H}_{[\underline{0}}$. As in Proposition 3.1 taking $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}}$ we also find an isomorphism $h : \pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})'' \to \pi_{\omega_{\underline{0}}}(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$.

We also set $\mathcal{N}_0 = E_{\underline{0}}\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{[\underline{0}}))''E_{\underline{0}}$ where $i_{\underline{n}} : \mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}} \to \mathcal{B}_{[\underline{n}}$ is the injective map in the directed limit set of C^*-algebras. We set $j_{\underline{t}} : \mathcal{N}_0 \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ injective homomorphism defined by

$$j_{\underline{t}}(x) = \theta_{\underline{t}}(E_{\underline{0}}xE_{\underline{0}})$$

As in Proposition 3.1 we also have $h(\mathcal{N}_0) = \mathcal{A}_0$ and $h \circ \eta_{\underline{t}}(x) = \tau_{\underline{t}}(h(x))$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}_0$ and $\underline{t} \geq \underline{0}$ via the co-variance relation $h \circ \theta_{\underline{t}} = \theta_{\underline{t}} \circ h$ on $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$ for all $\underline{t} \geq \underline{0}$.

We now set a net of von-Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}_{[\underline{t}} = \pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{[\underline{t}})''$ for all $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_k$. By von-Neumann's density theorem ω is pure if and only if $\vee_{\underline{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_k}\mathcal{A}_{[\underline{t}} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Though we do not have a global weak Markov property, we do have weak Markov property in a totally ordered subset of the lattice. The crucial point that by our construction we still have

$$E_{\underline{t}} \mathcal{A}_{[\underline{t}} E_{\underline{t}} = j_{\underline{t}}(\mathcal{N}_0))$$

which essentially takes over the role of weak Markov property and makes it enough to investigate asymptotic behavior of ω on $\mathcal{B}$. In the following we sum up our results on higher dimensional lattice.

THEOREM 5.1: Let ω be a translation invariant state on $\mathcal{B} = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_k} M_d^{\underline{n}}(\mathbb{C})$.

(a) ω is Kolmogorov if and only if $\tau_{\underline{t}}(x) \to \phi_0(x)$ in strong operator topology as $\underline{t} \to \underline{\infty}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ where $\phi_0(x) = < \Omega_{\underline{0}}, PxP\Omega_{\underline{0}} >$.

(b) ω is pure if there exists a sequence of elements $x_n \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $\underline{t_n} \in \mathbb{Z}_k$ such that for each $\underline{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_k$ we have $x_n \tau_{\underline{s}-\underline{t_n}}(x) \to \phi_0(x)$ in strong operator topology as $\underline{t_n} \to -\underline{\infty}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$.

(c) If ω is pure then $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$ is either type-I or a type-III factor.

(d) If $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a type-I von-Neumann algebra with center completely atomic then strong mixing, pure and Kolmogorov property of ω are equivalent.

(e) If ω is Kolmogorov then $(\mathcal{B}, \theta_{\underline{n}}, \omega)$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \theta_{\underline{n}}, \omega_\lambda)$ are isomorphic as C^*-dynamical systems where $\omega_\lambda = \otimes_{\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_k} \omega_\lambda^{\underline{n}}$ is a pure translation invariant product state on $\mathcal{B}$ where $\omega_\lambda^{\underline{n}}(e^i_j) = \bar{\lambda}_i \lambda_j$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_i)$ is an unit vector in $\mathbb{C}^d$ for all $\underline{n}$. Mean entropy of such an element ω with Kolmogorov's property is zero.

PROOF: For (a) we check the following steps for $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}_{[\underline{s}}$ with notation $j_{\underline{s}}(x) = E_{\underline{s}} X E_{\underline{s}}$ and $j_{\underline{s}}(y) = E_{\underline{s}} Y E_{\underline{s}}$ for some $x, y \in \mathcal{N}_0$: for all $\underline{t} \le \underline{s}$

$$< X\Omega, E_{\underline{t}} Y \Omega > = < E_{\underline{t}} E_{\underline{s}} X E_{\underline{s}} E_{\underline{t}} \Omega, E_{\underline{t}} E_{\underline{s}} Y E_{\underline{s}} E_{\underline{t}} \Omega >$$

$$< j_{\underline{t}}(\eta_{\underline{s}-\underline{t}}(x))\Omega, j_{\underline{t}}(\eta_{\underline{s}-\underline{t}}(y))\Omega >$$

$$= \phi_0(\eta_{\underline{s}-\underline{t}}(x^*)\eta_{\underline{s}-\underline{t}}(y)) \to \phi_0(x^*)\phi_0(y)$$

as $\underline{t} \to -\underline{\infty}$ where the last limit holds if and only if $\eta_{\underline{t}}(x) \to \phi_0(x)$ strongly as $\underline{t} \to \infty$ for each $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ by separating property of Ω for $\mathcal{A}_0$. Now use h to complete the proof for (a).

(b) follows along the same line of Theorem 2.1 aided with Kaplansky's density theorem and $E_{\underline{t}}\mathcal{A}_{[\underline{t}}E_{\underline{t}} = j_{\underline{t}}(\mathcal{N}_0)$ to ensure purity is equivalent to existence of an element $x_n \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $\underline{t_n} \in \mathbb{Z}_k$ such that $j_{\underline{t_n}}(x_n) \to |\Omega >< \Omega|$ in strong operator topology. We may identify $\mathcal{N}_0$ with $\mathcal{A}_0$ via the isomorphism. Rest of the proof also goes along the same line that of Theorem 2.1 with little modification that we used here for Kolmogorov's property.

Proof of (c) goes along the same line of Theorem 3.4. We give here an outline. Suppose not i.e. $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''$ is a type-II factor and then so is $\mathcal{A}_0 = P\pi_\omega(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}})''P$. Let p be a finite projection in $\mathcal{A}_0$. Then $j_{\underline{0}}(p)$ is also a finite projection in $\mathcal{A}_{[\underline{t}}$ for all $\underline{t} \le \underline{0}$. So by purity we have $j_{\underline{0}}(p)(\vee_{\underline{t}\le 0}\mathcal{A}_{[t)})j_{\underline{0}}(p)$ is equal to the set of bounded operators on $j_0(p)$. Once again for each $\underline{t} \le 0$, $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{t}} = j_{\underline{0}}(p)\mathcal{A}_{[t}j_{\underline{0}}(p)$ is a type-II$_1$ factor and $\vee_{\underline{t}\le\underline{0}}\mathcal{M}_{\underline{t}}$ admits a faithful trace [Di] and so we brings a contradiction as in Theorem 3.4.

Proof of (d) also follows along the same line of the proof for Theorem 2.7 once we note that the steps where we used weak Markov process can be replaced by the relation $E_{\underline{t}}\mathcal{A}_{[\underline{t}}E_{\underline{t}} = j_{\underline{t}}(\mathcal{A}_0)$ since $[\mathcal{A}_{[\underline{t}}\Omega] \uparrow I$ as $\underline{t} \downarrow -\underline{\infty}$ where we have identified $\mathcal{A}_0$ with $\mathcal{N}_0$ via the map h. Rest of the proof goes along the same line.

Any translation invariant pure state on $\mathcal{B}$ with Kolmogorov's property give rises to a Mackey's system of imprimitivity with relation $S_{\underline{m}}(E_{\underline{n}} \ominus |\Omega ><$

$\Omega|)S^*_{\underline{m}} = E_{\underline{n}+\underline{m}} - |\Omega >< \Omega|$ for the locally compact abelian group $\mathbb{Z}_k$ with Mackey index $\aleph_0$, where $S_{\underline{n}}$ is the unitary operator on the GNS space implementing the shift $\theta_{\underline{n}}$. That it is of index $\aleph_0$ follows along the same line since $\mathcal{B}_{\underline{0}}$ is a simple infinite dimensional C^*-algebra being the inductive limit of simple matrix C^* algebra. Thus the result follows by an application of Mackey's theorem for the group $\mathbb{Z}_k$ which ensures an inter-twiner operator between two such dynamics. ■

6 Appendix:

Here we give a sketch leaving details as it requires quite a different involved framework to prove our claim that the unique ground state ω_{XY} of H_{XY} [AraMa] model when restricted to one side of the chain $\mathcal{B}_R$ (or $\mathcal{B}_L$) is faithful. We refer to Chapter 6 of the monograph [EvKa] for details on the mathematical set up for the Fermion algebra and what follows now is based on [Ma3]. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space ($\mathcal{H} = L^2(R)$) and consider the universal simple unital C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}_F$ generated by $\{a(f) : f \in \mathcal{H}\}$ over $\mathcal{H}$ where $a : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_F$ is a conjugate linear map satisfying

$$a(f)a(g) + a(g)a(f) = 0$$

$$a(f)a(g)^* + a(g)^*a(f) =< g, f > 1$$

For an orthonormal basis $\{e_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for $\mathcal{H}$ we fix an unitary operator $U : e_j \rightarrow e_j$ if $j > 1$ otherwise $-e_j$. The universal property of CAR algebra ensures an automorphism α_- on $\mathcal{A}_F$ via the second quantization $a(f) \rightarrow a(Uf)$ i.e. $a(e_j) \rightarrow a(e_j)$ if $j \geq 1$ otherwise $a(e_j) \rightarrow -a(e_j)$ for $j \leq 1$, where $e_j(i) = \delta^i_j$ is the Dirac functions on j. Let $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F = \mathcal{A}_F \times |\mathbb{Z}_2$ the cross-product C^*-algebra.

Now we consider Pauli's C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}_P = \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M_2(\mathbb{C})$ with grading $\alpha_-(\sigma^k_z) = \sigma^k_z, \alpha(\sigma^k_x) = -\sigma^k_x$ and $\alpha(\sigma^k_y) = -\sigma^k_y$ where $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ are Pauli spin matrices if $k < 1$ and $\alpha_-(\sigma^k_w) = \sigma^k_w$ for all $w = x, y, z$ for $k \geq 1$. We consider the cross-product C^*-algebra $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_P = \mathcal{A}_P \times |\mathbb{Z}_2$. Jordan-Wigner transformation map J which takes

$$\sigma^i_z \to 2a(e_j)^* a(e_j) - 1,\ \sigma^j_x \to TS_j(a(e_j) + a(e_j)^*), \sigma^j_y \to TS_j i(a(e_j) - a(e_j)^*)$$

where $T = \otimes_{k \leq 0} \sigma^k_z$ and $S_j = 1$ if $j = 1$, $S_j = \otimes_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} \sigma^k_z$ if $j > 1$ and $S_j = \otimes_{j \leq k \leq 0} \sigma^k_z$ if $j < 1$ identifies $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F$ with $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_P$ as the Jordan map is co-variant with grading automorphism α_- and thus via this map we have also identified $\mathcal{A}^+_P$ with $\mathcal{A}^+_F$. There is a one to one affine correspondence between the set of even states of $\mathcal{A}_P$ and $\mathcal{A}_F$.

XY model $H_{XY} = -\sum_k \sigma^k_x \sigma^{k+1}_x + \sigma^k_y \sigma^{k+1}_y$ is an even Hamiltonian and the KMS state ω_β at inverse temperature being unique ω_β is also an even state. Thus the low temperature limiting state is also even and the ground state being unique it is also pure and translation invariant. The unique ground state ω_{XY} of XY model [AraMa] once restricted to $\mathcal{A}^+_P$ can be identified as restriction of a quasi-free state on $\mathcal{A}_F$ to $\mathcal{A}^+_F$.

Now by a lemma of Antony Wassermann [Wa, page 496] we have the following. Since the closed real subspace $\mathcal{K} = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : f(x) = \overline{f(x)}\}$ which we identify with the closed subspace generated by $\{e_j : j \geq 1\}$ satisfies the condition $\mathcal{K} + i\mathcal{K}$ dense in $\mathcal{H}$ (we have equality) and $\mathcal{K} \bigcap i\mathcal{K} = \{0\}$, we get Ω is also cyclic and separating for $\pi(\mathcal{A}^+_F)''$ i.e. $[\pi(\mathcal{A}^+_F)''\Omega] = [\pi(\mathcal{A}_F)''\Omega]$ where $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ is the GNS space of $(\mathcal{A}_F, \omega_{XY})$, where ω_{XY} is unique quasi-free state associated with unique ground state via Jordan map. Now going back to $\mathcal{A}^+_P$, we find ω_{XY} on $\mathcal{A}^+_P$ is faithful.

REFERENCES

- [Ac1] Accardi, L.: The non-commutative Markov property. (Russian) Funkcional. Anal. i Priloen. 9 (1975), no. 1, 1-8.

- [Ac2] Accardi, L.: Non-commutative Markov chains associated to a preassigned evolution: an application to the quantum theory of measurement. Adv. in Math. 29 (1978), no. 2, 226-243.

- [AcC] Accardi, Luigi; Cecchini, Carlo: Conditional expectations in von Neumann algebras and a theorem of Takesaki. J. Funct. Anal. 45 (1982), no. 2, 245-273.

- [AFL] Accardi, L, Frigerio, A, Lewis, John T. Quantum stochastic processes. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 18 (1982), no. 1, 97-133.

- [AM] Accardi, L., Mohari, A.: Time reflected Markov processes. Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top., vol-2, no-3, 397-425 (1999).

- [AKLT] Affleck, Ian; Kennedy, Tom; Lieb, Elliott H.; Tasaki, Hal Valence bond ground states in isotropic quantum antiferromagnets. Comm. Math. Phys. 115 (1988), no. 3, 477-528.

- [AL] Affleck, Ian; Lieb, Elliott H. A proof of part of Haldane's conjecture on spin chains. Lett. Math. Phys. 12 (1986), no. 1, 57-69.

- [AraMa] Araki, H., Matsui, T.: Ground states of the XY model, Commun. Math. Phys. 101, 213-245 (1985).

- [AraW] Araki, H., Woods, E. J.: Complete Boolean algebras of type I factors, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. Ser. A 2 (1966), 157242.

- [Ar1] Arveson, W.: Pure E_0-semi-groups and absorbing states. Comm. Math. Phys. 187 (1997), no. 1, 19–43.

- [Ar2] Arveson, W.: Noncommutative Dynamics and E_0-semi-groups, Springer Monogr. Math., Springer, New York, 2003.
- [BhP] Bhat, B.V.R., Parthasarathy, K.R.: Kolmogorov's existence theorem for Markov processes on C^*-algebras, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. 104,1994, p-253-262.
- [BR] Bratteli, Ola., Robinson, D.W. : Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics, I,II, Springer 1981.
- [BJP] Bratteli, Ola; Jorgensen, Palle E. T.; Price, Geoffrey L. Endomorphisms of B(H). Quantization, nonlinear partial differential equations, and operator algebra (Cambridge, MA, 1994), 93138, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 59, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.
- [BJKW] Bratteli, O., Jorgensen, Palle E.T., Kishimoto, Akitaka and Werner Reinhard F.: Pure states on $\mathcal{O}_d$, J.Operator Theory 43 (2000), no-1, 97-143.
- [De] Dell'Antonio, G.F.: On the limit of sequences of normal states, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 20 (1967) 413-429.
- [Di] Dixmier, J.: Von Neumann Algebras, North-Holland, 1981.
- [EvKa] Evans, D. E.; Kawahigashi,Y.: Quantum symmetries on operator algebras, Oxford University Press.
- [EvL] Evans, D. E.; Lewis, J. T.: Dilations of irreversible evolutions in algebraic quantum theory. Comm. Dublin Inst. Adv. Studies Ser. A No. 24 (1977), v+104 pp.
- [FNW1] Fannes, M., Nachtergaele, B., Werner, R.: Finitely correlated states on quantum spin chains, Commun. Math. Phys. 144, 443-490

(1992).

- [FNW2] Fannes, M., Nachtergaele, B., Werner, R.: Finitely correlated pure states, J. Func. Anal. 120, 511-534 (1994).
- [KMSW] Keyl,M., Matsui,T.,Schlingemann, Werner, R.F.: On Haag duality for pure states of quantum Spin Chain, Rev.Math.Phys. 20, 707-724 (2008).
- [Ma1] Matsui, T.: A characterization of pure finitely correlated states. Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. 1 (1998), no. 4, 647–661.
- [Ma2] Matsui, T.: The split property and the symmetry breaking of the quantum spin chain, Comm. Maths. Phys vol-218, 293-416 (2001).
- [Ma3] Matsui, T.: Private communication (2011).
- [Mac] Mackey, G.W.: Imprimitivity for representations of locally compact gropups I, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 35 (1949), 537-545.
- [Mo1] Mohari, A.: Markov shift in non-commutative probability, Jour. Func. Anal. 199 (2003) 189-209.
- [Mo2] Mohari, A.: Pure inductive limit state and Kolmogorov's property, J. Func. Anal. vol 253, no-2, 584-604 (2007) Elsevier Sciences.
- [Mo3] Mohari, A: Jones index of a completely positive map, Acta Applicandae Mathematicae. Vol 108, Number 3, 665-677 (2009)
- [Mo4] Mohari, A.: Translation invariant pure states and its split property, http://arxiv.org/abs/0904.2104

- [Mo5] Mohari, A: G. Birkhoff's problem in irreversible quantum dynamics, http://arxiv.org/abs/1006.5198
- [Mo6] Mohari, A: Quantum Dynamical Entropy from Relative entropy, http://arXiv:math/0701186.
- [Mo7] Mohari, A: Complete boolean algebra of type-I factors and Kolmogorov's property, under preparation.
- [Mu] Murphy, G.J.: C^*-algebras and operator theory, Academic Press, 1990.
- [NeS] Neshveyev, S.; Stormer, E. : Dynamical entropy in operator algebras. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [Or] Ornstein, D.: Bernoulli shifts with the same entropy are isomorphic. Advances in Math. 4, 337-352 (1970).
- [OP] Ohya, M., Petz, D.: Quantum entropy and its use, Text and monograph in physics, Springer-Verlag 1995.
- [Pa] Parry, W.: Topics in Ergodic Theory, Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- [Po1] Powers, R. T.: Representation of uniformly hyper-finite algebras and their associated von-Neumann rings, Ann. Math. 86 (1967), 138-171.
- [Po2] Powers, R. T.: Resistance inequalities for the isotropic Heisenberg ferromagnets, J. Math. Phys. 17 (1976), 1910-1918.
- [Po3] Powers, R. T.: A non-spatial continuous semi-group of $*$-endomorphisms of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 23 (1987), 1053-1069.

- [Po4] Powers, R. T.: An index theory for semi-groups of $*$-endomorphisms of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and type II_1 factors. Canad. J. Math. 40 (1988), no. 1, 86-114.
- [Ru] Ruelle, D. States of physical systems, Comm. Math. Phys. 3 (1966), no. 2, 133-150.
- [Sak] Sakai, S.: C^*-algebras and W^*-algebras, Springer 1971.
- [Sa] Sauvageot, Jean-Luc: Markov quantum semi-groups admit covariant Markov C^*-dilations. Comm. Math. Phys. 106 (1986), no. 1, 91-103.
- [Sim] Simon, B.: The statistical mechanics of lattice gases, vol-1, Princeton series in physics (1993).
- [Ta] Takesaki, M. : Theory of Operator algebras II, Springer, 2001.
- [Vi] Vincent-Smith, G. F.: Dilation of a dissipative quantum dynamical system to a quantum Markov process. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 49 (1984), no. 1, 58-72.
- [Wa] Wassermann, A.: Operator algebras and conformal field theory, Invent. Math. 133, 467-538 (1998).